

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

To the literature of the Fourth Gospel a charming addition has been made by Professor Percy GARDNER. It is charming, not because we are likely to agree with the conclusions to which its author comes, but because we see that he comes to his conclusions honestly and competently, and that then he expresses them in language of quite unusual felicity.

The Fourth Gospel is called *The Ephesian Gospel*, and that is the title of the book (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net). It is called the Ephesian Gospel because it was written in Ephesus. Of that Professor GARDNER has no doubt. The tradition goes back to the second century, 'and there is no rival view of any importance.' It is called the Ephesian Gospel, however, most of all, because in this book Professor GARDNER lays stress on its relation to the religion and thought of 'the most important of the Greek cities of Asia Minor.'

And so the question is raised at once, Who wrote the Ephesian Gospel? Professor GARDNER says we do not know. He even says we shall never know. But, in spite of that, he comes very near to telling us. He says that there are three Johns to think about. There is John the Apostle, who could not have written it. There is John the Prophet, who wrote the Apocalypse, and therefore

could not have written it. And there is John the Elder, who wrote the two short 'Epistles according to St. John,' and who on that account could not have written it. The Gospel and the first Epistle were certainly written by the same man. Who was he, and what was his name? We do not know what his name was, but Dr. Percy GARDNER believes that he was a disciple of John the Apostle.

Why could not John the Apostle have written the Ephesian Gospel himself? Professor GARDNER gives several reasons. First of all, he says generally that John the son of Zebedee is so improbable that we may regard him as set aside. Next, he says that as a literary composition it is quite beyond the powers of the fisherman of Galilee. 'It is very doubtful whether John the fisherman of Galilee would have had sufficient literary training to write any continuous composition, above all a composition in a language so little familiar to the Galilean peasants as Greek.' Then it seems to him 'quite incredible that if the Apostle John were the actual writer of the Gospel, he should have designated himself in it by the phrase "the disciple whom Jesus loved."' And finally, 'it is all but impossible that one who had been an actual companion of Jesus should have had all his recollections so transmuted in course of time that the Jesus reflected in the Synoptic Gospels should

have become transformed into the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel.'

So, you see, there is no actual evidence against the Apostle or in favour of another. It is all a matter of the impossible and the improbable. And as soon as Professor GARDNER'S impossibles and impossibles are examined by some one else they have a way of passing into the possible and the probable. They do so sometimes even in his own hands. The last, for example. 'I say "all but impossible,"' he adds, 'not "impossible,"' because the early history of Christianity is so full of the utterly unexpected, of events which a historian finds it very difficult to account for, that one can scarcely venture to say what is and what is not impossible. The inspiration of the Church worked in ways so strange that we can only follow it with open minds and bated breath.'

The conclusion, then, is this. 'A man of philosophic mind and profound genius, had been as a young man converted by the preaching of St. Paul, which teaching he never did more than modify, never gave up. Afterwards coming under the strong influence of St. John or one of his immediate followers, he heard many details of the life of Jesus, listening with ears still full of the Pauline teaching, and a heart full of the spiritual presence of the Christ of the Church. The simple narrative of the eye-witness took in his mind a new and exalted character. He was convinced that the Apostles, even the most favoured of them, did not fully comprehend the life which was unrolled before them, and accepted the teaching only as it lay on the surface, not understanding the depths which lay beneath. Often between the words of his teacher he would see an opening into great spiritual vistas. At the same time, he clearly had a deep love and profound admiration for the son of Zebedee: he realised that the relation in which he had stood to his Master consecrated him for ever. Only, his eyes had been dazzled by seeing: those who had not seen, like St. Paul and himself, were in a sense more blessed; because to

the vision of faith only, and not to the eyes of the body, could the true majesty of Jesus Christ become clear.'

The first question for the Christian preacher is, 'What shall I preach?' To which the answer is, 'The Gospel.' For assuredly, if he does not preach the Gospel, he is not a Christian preacher. 'Unto you is born this day in the city of David a saviour'—that is the beginning of the Gospel. That is the very first word of Christianity. And unless he begins there we say he is not a Christian preacher.

The second question is, 'How shall I preach it?' It is a much less important question, and may receive more than one good answer. But there are especially two answers that are good. One is, 'Preach it exegetically'; the other, 'Preach it topically.'

For many a day in this land of ours the only acceptable preaching was exegetical. In the morning the portion of Scripture expounded was short; in the afternoon it was long. The short exposition was called a sermon, the long a lecture. But, long or short, sermon or lecture, it was an explanation and application of a definite passage of Scripture.

Then came a change. It was a change of the second diet of worship from the afternoon to the evening. And corresponding to that change, perhaps partly the cause of it, was the substitution of a topic for a text. The topic at first was often ethical or even political. The more it departed from the exposition of a text, the more attention it attracted. But soon the ethical or political topic became as stale, flat, and unprofitable as any of the uses of this weary world. And then the discovery was made that if the topic were taken from the Bible and well managed, it was quite as good as a text and quite as lasting in interest.

And well managed, we say. For the topic is not so easily managed as the text. It requires

more literature. It demands more knowledge of the Bible. It calls for more patience in the selection and arrangement of materials.

Then another discovery was made. While a text is better to be begun and ended in one sermon, a topic is better to run over several sermons. Each sermon should be complete in itself. But if in its completeness it is not also isolated, but gives to and receives from the sermons that surround it, the interest in it is keener and the profit of it greater. That is why a modern preacher so often chooses a great subject and bases a whole winter's course of sermons on it.

And that is why the editor of this journal has determined to issue a series of volumes on the Great Christian Doctrines. He has long recognized the unsatisfactoriness of the occasional topic as well as of the occasional text. No doubt a small topic can and must be exhausted in a single sermon. But the great topics, like the great texts, are always better than the small. Then the leap from one topic or text to another gives a wrong impression of the unity of Revelation, and probably encourages a restless habit of mind. There is the interest of the moment, perhaps; there never is the sustenance which the systematic study of the Word furnished to our fathers.

The first doctrine chosen is Prayer. It is divided into twenty chapters. Each chapter fills about twenty pages. It contains more than any man should have in a single sermon, the idea being to provide plenty of material, especially illustrative material, and leave the preacher to make his own selection.

The first chapter is introductory. It has two divisions, the Proof of Prayer, and the Practice of it. The second chapter tells what Prayer is. It is Desire; it is Communion; it is Petition. Then the five great divisions of Prayer—Adoration, Confession, Petition, Intercession, Thanksgiving—are explained each in a separate chapter, and illus-

trated at every step of the explanation by short pointed quotations from recent literature.

The next three chapters make known the demands of prevailing prayer. The First Principles of Prayer are 'According to the Will of God,' 'In the Name of Christ,' and 'In the Power of the Spirit.' The Personal Demands of Prayer are Knowledge, Repentance, the Three Great Graces, and Importunity. Minor Aids to Prayer are Preparation, Practice, Definiteness, Humility, Energy, Patience, Service.

The eleventh chapter meets the Scientific Objections to Prayer; the twelfth, the Philosophical. Here a striking change of emphasis is to be noticed. A generation ago the scientific objections were uppermost and almost unanswerable. To-day they do not count. The real difficulties are philosophical. They are treated in this chapter in five parts—'Our Self-sufficiency,' 'The War of Interests,' 'What is Man?', 'A Perfect Providence,' and 'The Unchangeable Will.'

The next four chapters discuss the Value of Prayer, Hindrances to Prayer, Encouragements to Prayer, and the Perplexities of Prayer, separating these carefully and keeping in close touch with experience. The Perplexities of Prayer refer to the facts that sometimes there is no answer, sometimes the answer is delayed, and sometimes it is altogether different from that which was prayed for. This introduces the whole subject of Answers to Prayer dealt with in the seventeenth chapter, which ends with a discussion of the difficult matter of spiritual communications that pass like wireless telegrams from one person to another.

With the seventeenth chapter the subject could be closed. The eighteenth gives some account of Prayers to the Persons of the Trinity. The nineteenth considers fit times for Prayer. The twentieth gathers together some interesting facts on the Manner of Prayer, and contains a short discussion of the relative value of Extempore and

Liturgical Prayer. The last section of all shows the important place that belongs to the Voice in Prayer.

From the beginning of the book to the end of it two things are kept firmly to the front. The one thing is clear arrangement and steady progress. The other is contact with reality. No desire has existed in the mind of the editor to furnish any man with a ready-made series of sermons. To get the good of the book the preacher should read the open type and make his own sermon. Then he should read the illustrations and use them as freely as he pleases.

Five lectures were delivered at the University of London in February and March on *The International Crisis in its Ethical and Psychological Aspects* (Oxford University Press; 3s. 6d. net). One of the lecturers was Professor Gilbert MURRAY, whose subject was 'Herd Instinct and the War.'

What does Professor MURRAY mean by herd instinct? He takes two paragraphs to tell us. These are the paragraphs. He says: 'At the Natural History Museum, South Kensington, close to the entrance, you can buy for the sum of fourpence a most fascinating little book on *The Fossil Remains of Man*. It is official and, I presume, authoritative. And it tells how, in very remote times, before there was any South Kensington Museum, or any England, or, I believe, in the strict sense, any Europe, there lived in swampy forests in various parts of the world, troops of little lemur-like tree-dwellers. They were, I suppose, rather like small monkeys, but much prettier. They had nice fur, good prehensile tails, and effective teeth. Then there fell upon them, or some of them, a momentous change, a hypertrophy or over-development of one part of the body. This kind of special increase, the author tells us, seldom stops till it becomes excessive. With the lemurs it was the brain which began to grow. It grew and grew, both in size and in complexity.

The rest of the body suffered in consequence. The fur became mangy and disappeared. The prehensile tails wasted away. The teeth ceased to be useful as weapons. And in the end, Ladies and Gentlemen, after incalculable ages, here we are!'

'Now,' he continues, 'these lemurs had certain instincts and habits of life. Let us define our terms. By an instinct I mean, following the exposition of Dr. McDougall, an innate psychophysical disposition to notice objects of a certain class, to feel about them in certain ways and to act correspondingly. They would notice an enemy, hate him and spit at him; notice an object that was good to eat, desire it and eat it. They made love, they protected their young, they defended their group against other groups. And primitive man inherited, with modifications, their instincts, and we have similarly inherited his. Some of them were generally desirable, and are consequently admitted and encouraged; others were generally undesirable, and have been habitually denied and suppressed in our conscious life, only to break out in dreams, in fits of insanity or passion, or more subtly in self-deception. But, suppressed or unsuppressed, man's instincts form the normal motive force in his life, though the direction of that force may from time to time be controlled by conscious reason.'

But what has herd instinct to do with the war? The war has produced both good results and evil results. These results, whether good or bad, are largely due to herd instinct.

The good results are 'a greater seriousness of life, less complaining, less obvious selfishness, and more hardihood. There is a universal power of self-sacrifice whose existence we never suspected before; on every side young men are ready to go and face death for their country, and parents are ready to let them go. There is more brotherhood and more real democracy; and at the same time, a quality of which we stood in much need, far more discipline and obedience.'

The evil results are yet more evident. So evident are they that Professor MURRAY scarcely troubles to name them. He only says that reformers and idealists are disheartened, that the friends of peace, of women's causes, of legal reform, of the mitigation of cruelty to animals, are all reduced to something like impotence; and that one hears the statement made that 'there is no Christianity left.'

The herd instinct is the source of both good and bad. Not all the good that the war has brought us, nor all the bad, can be traced to it. But much of both. And it seems to Professor Gilbert MURRAY that in the highest region of all the evil is likely to predominate.

The highest region of all is religion. Now there is nothing more manifest than that the war is changing the attitude of many men to religion. Some men it is making more religious and others less. Professor MURRAY talked on different days to two soldiers in Flanders, who spoke of their feelings of terror. One said, 'It made you believe in God, I can tell you.' The other said, 'It made you doubt the existence of God.' But the most pronounced and pitiable outcome of the war is the creation of a God after the image of his creator. And this is due to the herd instinct, the instinct that seeks the preservation of the nation.

Professor MURRAY refers to Mr. DYSON's 'finely tragic' cartoon entitled 'Alone with his God.' The Kaiser is kneeling, a devout and fully armed figure, before another Kaiser exactly the same in dress and feature, but gigantic, august, enthroned amid the incense of ruined towns and burning churches. And there is a worse thing than that.

Besides the Kaiser's God of ruined towns and burning churches is the people's God of revenge. A Danish friend has sent Dr. MURRAY a quotation from a German religious poet, 'much admired in evangelical circles.' 'We have become the nation

of wrath,' says the poet; 'we accomplish the almighty will of God, and will vengefully wreak the demands of His righteousness on the godless, filled with sacred fury.'

There are few occupations more interesting or, generally speaking, more futile, than to attempt to overturn the judgment of the ages. Yet it has been done. Mary Magdalene is an example. For many centuries Mary Magdalene was identified with 'the woman that was a sinner.' No scholar makes that identification now. Whatever Christ did for her when He drove the seven devils out of her, no scholar believes now that He rescued her from a life of infamy.

In challenging the judgment of the ages it is always an advantage to be able to show when and how the ages went wrong. We can do this in the case of Mary Magdalene. When Johnson was asked by a lady about a certain definition in his Dictionary, how it was that he came to define *Pastern* as the *knee* of a horse, he at once answered, 'Ignorance, madam, pure ignorance!' The answer of those who identified Mary Magdalene with the woman that was a sinner ought to be the same. Pure ignorance! They did not know the Gospels. They did not know that the stories about Mary Magdalene which passed from mouth to mouth in their day were not contained in the Gospels, but were contradicted by the Gospels. They wanted a name for the woman that was a sinner. They did not know that the Gospels had not given her the name of Mary Magdalene. Pure ignorance, madam! And in this case the judgment of the ages has been reversed.

The judgment of the ages must be reversed in another case. It is the case of 'the woman that was a sinner.' The judgment has been that she was a woman of abandoned life. Again the verdict was given in ignorance. It is a cruel verdict. It does the woman an intolerable injustice. It will have to go.

What is the evidence? It is given by Dr. PLUMMER in his edition of *St. Luke* in the International Critical Series of Commentaries. The evidence—there are those who will be astonished to hear it—the evidence is wholly contained in the one word ‘sinner.’ When Dr. PLUMMER has set down the Greek word (ἁμαρτωλός) which is translated here, as elsewhere, ‘sinner,’ he adds this note: ‘A person of notoriously bad character and probably a prostitute.’

Now there is no doubt that the woman was a sinner. Where is the woman that is not? But you go rather far if you say of every sinner, ‘a person of notoriously bad character.’ And when you add ‘probably a prostitute,’ you are guilty of an outrageous offence. Yet there is no reason why ‘sinner’ should be translated ‘prostitute’ here more than elsewhere.

It is not to the point to say, as Dr. PLUMMER does, that the word translated ‘sinner’ sometimes has the meaning of ‘prostitute.’ A euphemism is allowable always. But when it has that meaning it is made quite plain that a euphemism is in use. Dr. PLUMMER does not quote a single example in which the word itself has that meaning. It is true he bids us compare Mt 21³². But when we turn to Mt 21³², what do we find? Not the word ‘sinner,’ but the word ‘prostitute’ (πόρνη). The truth is that when the Bible means prostitute, it says prostitute. The text to which Dr. PLUMMER points is plain enough: ‘The publicans and the harlots believed him.’

What is the reason, then, that this woman who was a sinner has been so long and so generally regarded as a prostitute? Ignorance, madam! It has not been observed (though it is convincing enough when one does observe it) that the word ‘sinner’ has in the Synoptic Gospels a technical meaning. It describes a certain well-defined class of the people. In our Lord’s day the nation of the Jews was divided into two classes, the ‘righteous’ (οἱ δίκαιοι) and the ‘sinners’ (οἱ

ἁμαρτωλοί). In saying, ‘I came not to call the righteous, but sinners’ (Mt 9¹³), Christ included all the people, and at the same time separated them into their two commonly recognized classes.

The division into two classes was so well known and so unhesitatingly admitted that Jesus did not need to explain. They all recognized the righteous; they all recognized the sinners. In general one might say that the righteous were those who knew the Law and endeavoured to keep it. The sinners did not know it, and for the most part did not try to keep even as much of it as they knew. What was the result? The result was contempt for the sinners on the part of the righteous and a comfortable dismissal of them to damnation. ‘This people who knoweth not the law are cursed.’

And the righteous were very particular that there should be no intercourse between them and the sinners. This was their first and probably their last objection to Jesus. ‘This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them.’ Well, one day one of the righteous class—his name was Simon—invited Jesus to dinner. While the dinner was in progress a woman who belonged to the sinner class came in and stood behind Jesus, weeping; and as she wept she wiped her tears off His feet with her hair. Simon was shocked. Not because she was a prostitute, but because she was a sinner. Had she been a prostitute he would certainly have been no more troubled than he was. It was not the degree of her sin that shocked him. It was the fact that Jesus, who was one of the righteous class, should allow a person who belonged to the class of sinners to come into close contact with Him.

The exact translation of the Greek words, according to the Revised Version, is: ‘And behold, a woman which was in the city, a sinner.’ That is to say, she was known in the city to belong to the sinners. The words seem to be purposely chosen to bring that out. But evidently, thought

Simon, Jesus is not aware of that. Dr. PLUMMER thinks that the city was Capernaum. It may have been, and again it may not. We do not know. But whatever city it was, Jesus would not be so well acquainted with the people as Simon, who lived in it, and whose first care it was to see that the distinction between the righteous and the sinners was maintained. Still, he argued with himself, if Jesus had been a prophet He would have known. Simon concluded that He was not a prophet. And no doubt he thought it was well worth giving the dinner to find that out.

Now if there is nothing to show that the woman was a person of evil fame, we shall henceforth give her the benefit. But is there nothing against it? There is this tremendous thing at least. When Jesus dismissed her with the blessing of forgiveness—just as he dismissed Zacchæus, who also was a sinner, and the nameless cripple who ‘was borne of four’—He used these words: ‘for she loved much.’ It is almost incredible, but it is true, that into these words men have calmly read a reference to prostitution—as if our Lord were likely to speak of a life of lust and call it a life of love.

But there is another objection. By making this sinner a prostitute we have missed the lesson which the Evangelists wished to teach us when they selected this incident for narration. It is the lesson that it is easier for a sinner than for a righteous person to enter the Kingdom. Why is it easier? It is easier because the righteous person needs to be converted, and the sinner does not.

The righteous person needs to be converted, or, to use the better word of the Gospel, he needs to be ‘born again.’ In setting out to find God he has taken a wrong turning, and he has proceeded all the while along a wrong road. He has to be brought back. He has to begin again at the beginning. He has to start life anew as a little child. He has to proceed, not by counting the command-

ments that he keeps and the good deeds that he does, but by trusting and loving. ‘Except ye turn,’ said Jesus, ‘and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.’

The sinner does not require to be converted. He has sinned, as the righteous man has sinned. It is most probable that he has sinned more. In the Parable of the Two Debtors, Jesus gave Simon the benefit. Simon owed fifty pence; the woman owed five hundred. But fifty pence is as sure to damn a man as five hundred if he cannot get it paid. And there is no way by which the righteous man can get it paid. He must reluctantly take down every stone of the building which he has so laboriously built and begin again, for there is a fault in its foundation. The sinner has built no building. He has simply to begin to trust and love at the point where he is now standing. A ‘God be merciful to me a sinner,’ if it is sincere, is all that is required of him.

There is no lesson more insistently taught in all the Gospels. Jesus taught it in many ways. Wherever He went He taught it. He used a great variety of illustrations to catch the attention and reach the heart with it. He used the illustration of the two sons, one of whom said he would go and went not, while the other said he would not go but went. He used the illustration of the other two sons, one of whom departed to a far country and spent his substance in riotous living, while the other stayed at home and served. He used the illustration of the Pharisee and the publican who went up to the temple to pray. And He used the illustration here of the two debtors, one of whom owed five hundred pence, while the other owed but fifty. It is the lesson of lessons; and in this most pathetic example of it, more pathetic even than the story of the Prodigal, we have missed its meaning in our desire to prove that the worst of sinners may be saved, the very lesson being that degree of demerit has no place in the presence of the mercy of God in Christ.

The Unrealized Christianity of Shelley.

BY ELEANOR ANGLIN JOHNSON, WESLEY MANSE, POLMONT.

THE other day while reading Shelley in order to tonic my mind and regain moral balance after a perusal of the daily paper, with its home-shattering columns of dead and wounded, and the pitifully inadequate mask of sanity with which it makes believe to cover the hideous and imbecile face of war, I was struck afresh and very forcibly by what might be called this poet's unconscious Christianity.

Now, as everybody knows, Shelley did not account himself, and has never been accounted by his readers, a believer in Christ, and I certainly do not wish to make out that he was one. He wrote several very strong denunciations of Christianity and 'priests' (a nomenclature meant to include all Christian preachers), and the only excuses for them are that he never met a true Christian minister, that the hypocrites he met bearing the name of Christ were infinitely less Christlike than himself, that the horrors of bloodshed and barbaric wrong which have been committed in Christ's name through the centuries roused his gentle and freedom-loving soul to strong indignation. Also he was young, barely thirty when he died, and he lived during the French Revolution. But it is only fair to add that, burning as are the words levied against Christianity, there is no word concerning Christ in all Shelley's works, prose or poetry, that is not fraught with some measure of admiration. With crude, boyish reasoning he describes Christianity as the 'established religion which war, imprisonment, assassination, and falsehood; deeds of unexampled and incomparable atrocity have made what it is,' but Jesus 'stands in the foremost list of those true heroes who have died in the glorious martyrdom of liberty, and have braved torture, contempt, and poverty in the cause of suffering humanity.' These words are in the notes of the earliest of his poems, but many proofs that all his life Shelley hated this 'established religion,' whether in the form of Protestantism or of Roman Catholicism, could be quoted from his later works. It is futile to conjecture what changes of thought would have taken place in his mind had he lived to maturity; the aim of this article is not in any way to class Shelley as a Christian poet. Nor is it its aim to try to show how nearly his

ideals of character and world-order coincide with true Christian conceptions, though indeed Christ's 'Sermon on the Mount' with its beatification of meekness, purity, self-sacrifice, peace, mercy, and endurance has no more beautiful or more passionate auxiliary than Shelley's poetry. But it is not as the unchristian poet of peculiarly Christian ideals that I wish to speak of him. Strange as it may sound to some, it was as a man who has all unknowingly touched rock-bottom; who has grasped unwittingly the most fundamental of Christian truths, rather than simply as a poet of Christian ideals, that Shelley arrested my thoughts once more the other night. I might quote from several of his poems, but the most significant exposition of what I mean is found in 'Prometheus Unbound,' and I will confine myself to that.

In this splendid and all too little read drama Shelley imagines two mighty powers at strife; the one, Prometheus, typifying good, the other, Jupiter, typifying evil. The whole poem is highly imaginative, but the basic conceptions are soon given, and it is on these only that stress will be laid.

Jupiter, the usurping evil one, is omnipotent for the time being. He fills the world with woe and strife, man under his rule is at once 'despot, slave, dupe, and deceiver.' Because of his reign

First famine, and then toil, and then disease,
Strife, wounds and ghastly death unseen before
Fell; and the unseasonable seasons drove
With alternating shafts of frost and fire,
Their shelterless, pale tribes to mountain caves;
And in their desert hearts fierce wants he sent,
And mad disquietudes, and shadows idle
Of unreal good.

He sent

Abandoned hope, and love that turns to hate;
And self-contempt, bitterer to drink than blood;
Pain, whose unheeded and familiar speech
Is howling, and keen shrieks, day after day.

Surely this is only another picture of the Fall.

No more faithful account than this has been given in poetry of the ravaging work of evil in the world and in the individual heart. Prometheus, the lover of men, half-man, half-god himself, is the only one able or willing to strive with this tyrant. Neither threats nor promises move him. Jupiter

chains him to a rock and sends agonizing torments upon him. In the Greek myth these torments are merely physical, in Shelley they are such as we believe Christ suffered on Calvary. They are awful, spiritual torments such as the human mind can only dream and not realize. I know no more tremendous description of spiritual suffering in English poetry than the one in 'Prometheus Unbound' when the Furies from Jupiter attack their victim.

In this scene Prometheus has a vision of the whole weight of the world's sin; its misery, its hatred, cruelty, madness, pain, tyranny. He sees its mild and gentle heroes done to death and, what is worse, the faiths they kindled prostituted, and their gracious names cursed because of them. To me this scene has sometimes been a more forcible and understanding commentary on the words, 'He took on himself the sins of the whole world,' than Christian preachers' words on The Atonement. Had he but known, the vision of Calvary was not far from Shelley when he wrote it, for he makes his Prometheus suffer on his rock the miseries of the whole earth.

Again, he dwells on the essential thing—the *spiritual* agony undergone. The physical pain, the personal degradation are nothing.

'Thou thinkest we will rend thee bone from bone
And nerve from nerve, working like fire within?'

'Dost imagine

We will but laugh into thy lidless eyes?'

cry the Furies to Prometheus, but such pain is only as a drop in a deluge of agony. His real torture is incalculable:

desperate tides of the whole great world's anguish
Forced through the channels of a single heart.

It must be noticed further that Shelley makes this suffering fall upon Prometheus not only as a punishment for former help given to mankind, as in the Greek legend, but because he hopes through this self-effacement and sacrifice to 'redeem the world and make it the home of Love.

A beautiful chorus of gracious spirits follows this awful scene, a chorus of hope and triumph such as wise angels might have sung when Christ died on the Cross and His disciples mourned disconsolate. Here is a small part of it:

Chorus. Tho' Ruin now Love's shadow be,
Following him, destroyingly,
On Death's white and winged steed,
Which the fleetest cannot flee,

Trampling down both flower and weed,
Man and beast, and foul and fair,
Like a tempest thro' the air;
Thou shalt quell this horseman grim,
Woundless though in heart and limb.
Prometheus. Spirits, how know ye this shall be?
Chorus. In the atmosphere we breathe,
As buds grow red when the snow-storms flee,
From spring gathering up beneath,
Whose wild winds shake the elder brake,
And the wandering herdsmen know
That the whitethorn soon will blow:
Wisdom, Justice, Love, and Peace,
When they struggle to increase,
Are to us as soft winds be
To shepherd boys, *the prophecy*
That begins and ends in Thee.

This, then, is the first thing I claim for Shelley: he realized, though only in thought and unconnected with the fact of Christ, two fundamentals of our religion. He realized that in the world is evil so strong and regnant that mere man is helpless against it, and further that some Being in whom Power and Love are united must suffer with infinite meekness and self-sacrifice for the redemption of mankind. We read in Paul's Epistle to the Philippians concerning the meek sacrifice of Christ, 'He made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death,'—in order to kill sin in the hearts of men. A Christian poet whose lines are continually quoted as interpretations of Scripture words the vision of David concerning Christ's sacrifice thus:

He who did most shall bear most: the strongest shall
stand the most weak.

'Tis the weakness in strength that I cry for, my flesh that
I seek

In the Godhead. I seek it and find it. . . .

Shelley's conception of a Redeemer is identical with these:

Resist not the weakness;
Such strength is in meekness
That the Eternal, the Immortal,
Must unloose thro' life's portal
The snakelike Doom coiled underneath his throne
By that alone.

Secondly, I wish to notice briefly, for this is not so startlingly surprising as the ideas already referred to—Shelley's immovable belief in the ultimate reign of good through sacrifice. Jupiter

—Evil—may reign now, but he is by nature subject: 'All spirits are enslaved which serve things evil.' What is the poet's conception of a redeemed world? What is the result of Prometheus's wisdom, courage, and long-suffering love? Simply it is this:

All things had put their evil nature off.

As it was Shelley's, it is the Christian hope also; Love is to rule the world, and Love alone. The world of men, he tells us in the last triumphant scene of the play, will still have labour and grief to fight against, but

Familiar acts are beautiful through Love;
Labour and pain and grief in life's green grove
Sport like tame beasts, none knew how gentle they
could be.

War, oppression, hate, revenge and all the evils which have been born of sin disappear. Mankind is addressed thus:

Man, who wert once a despot and a slave;
A dupe and a deceiver; a decay;

A traveller from the cradle to the grave
Through the dim light of this immortal day;

Love, from its awful throne of patient power
In the wise heart, from the last giddy hour
Of dead endurance, from the slippery, steep,
And narrow verge of craglike agony, springs
And folds over the world its healing wings.

The world is saved by and shall become the home of Love.

Instead of Prometheus, Shelley could in his great drama have made Christ his hero without changing the *fundamental* argument of the poem: for that argument is nothing less nor more than the spectacle of Good unsubdued by Evil, the supreme Goodness suffering, in love and power, untold agony for the redemption of man and the triumph of Love. The author of this drama is one of that spiritual company who have unknowingly clasped Christ's hand and looked into His heart of Love and Strength.

The Niffer Story of the Creation and the Flood.

BY THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., LONDON.

In June 1913, Dr. Arno Poebel gave, in the University of Pennsylvania *Museum Journal*, an account of the Creation and the Flood as current about 2000 years B.C. at the Babylonian city of Niffer, which is identified with the Calneh of Gn 10⁹. This was merely a preliminary outline of the record which, owing to the enterprise and generosity of the subscribers of the fund for excavations in Babylonia, had been acquired by the intermediary of Professor H. V. Hilprecht, for the Pennsylvania University Museum. The document in question forms one of those excavated between the years 1888 and 1900, of which about 10,000 were unpacked in 1910.

The tablet is described as measuring 5½ inches high by 7 inches wide. About a third of the document is preserved, which would make the original height to have been 12 or 14 inches. Each side has three columns of writing, now in part somewhat defaced and mutilated, but originally very clear and distinct. As it is the lower part of the obverse and the upper part of the reverse which

has been preserved, the beginning and the end are wanting. The 2nd and 3rd columns are separated by a wide gap, but the text of the 3rd column is immediately followed by that of the 4th. In their present mutilated state, however, it cannot be said that their connexion is very satisfactory. The 4th, 5th, and 6th columns, like the 2nd and 3rd, are also separated from each other by a wide gap.

Where the text opens—about two-thirds down the 1st column—some divine personage is speaking—probably the deity associated with Nintu(r), the great mother-goddess, in the work of creation.

2. 'Let us [restore?] my mankind on their destruction—
- 3-4. Nin-tu(r), let us restore my creation. . . .
5. Let us return the people into their settlements,
6. Let them rebuild their cities,
7. let them unite under their (the gods') protection.

8. Let them lay the brickwork of (the gods')
houses in a pure place,
9. Our vessels in a pure place let them shape.'
10. With holy fire the foundation he made
straight,
11. The sublime law he perfected there.
12. Where he spoke, he made the decree.
13. After Ana, Enlilla, Enki, Nin-hursagga
14. Had created the black-headed ones (man),
15. The root (?) of the ground in the ground
he set,
16. The four-limbed animals of the plain
17. meetly he produced.

COLUMN 2.

(About two-thirds wanting.)

Apparently some divine personage is again speaking, and there is a reference to looking upon some one—probably the creator of all things. The text then goes on:

8. . . . the creator of the land . . .
9. The . . . of royalty he brought forth—
10. He brought forth the sublime . . ., the
seat of royalty
11. He perfected the [sub]lime [commands].
12. [In holy places 5] ci[ties h]e founded—
13. He procl[aimed] their names, he allotted
them to rulers.
- 14-15. The central city, Êridu, the chief Nidum-
mud founded;
16. The second, the *tunugira*, the fortification of
Kis, he founded;
17. The third, Larak (Larancha), Pa-pil-hursag
founded;
18. The fourth, Zimbir (Sippar), Utu (the
sun-god) founded;
19. The fifth, Šuruppak, Sukurrura (or Šurup-
pak) founded.
20. These cities he proclaimed by name—
21. he appointed to a commander.
22. He dug the watercourses, made plentiful
the rains, and set water therein;
23. He made the small rivers, their branches,
producing plenty (?).

COLUMN 3.

(About two-thirds lost, much defaced where the text opens, and the ends of the lines in some cases wanting.)

Poebel sees in the much-defaced 11th line, at the beginning, the word *uku*, 'people,' and at the beginning of the 12th *ameru*, 'a rainstorm.' In the 14th line 'they' seem to have 'made' something. The text then continues:

15. At that time Nin-tu [*screamed*] like [a
*woman in travail*¹];
16. The holy Ištar wailed on account of her
people;
17. Enki took counsel with his own heart.
18. Anu, Enlilla, Enki, Nin-hursagga, . . .
19. The gods of heaven and earth, in[voked]
the name of Ana-Enlilla.
20. At that time Zi-û-sudu the king (was) the
anointing priest of . . .
21. A great AN-SAG² he made . . .
22. In solitude giving voice, in reverence . . .
23. Daily patiently standing . . .
24. Producing (things which) were not dreams,
a response(?) . . .
25. Invoking the name of heaven and earth . . .

COLUMN 4.

1. For the enclosure (?) the gods . . . a wall (?) ;
2. Zi-û-sudu, standing at its side, heard (?)
3. 'By the support (on) my left hand, stand ;
4. 'By the support I will speak a word to
thee . . .
5. 'My holy one, thine ear [to me incline].
6. 'At our hands a water-flood upon the
comman[ders]
7. will [be sent],
8. 'To destroy the seed of mankind . . .
9. 'the decision is the pronouncement of the
assembly [of the gods] . . .
10. 'The command of Ana-Enlilla . . .
11. 'His kingdom, his rule . . .'
12. To him (?) . . .
13. In his . . . he . . .

(The remainder of the column, about two-thirds, is wanting.)

COLUMN 5.

1. All the powerful wind-storms as one
rushed forth

¹ Such is Poebel's suggested restoration.

² Such is the ideographic writing, but it may have been pronounced *saggar* or *dunga*. This latter word is a synonym of *lumha*, and both apparently stand for musical instruments of some kind. Cf. the next line.

2. A water-flood over¹ the [hostile] raged.
3. For 7 days and 7 nights,
4. After the water-flood had raged over the land,
5. The mighty boat had been wind-driven over the swollen waters,
6. Utu (the sun-god) came forth again, on heaven and earth making day.
7. Zi-û-sudu opened a window(?) of the mighty boat—
8. The hero Utu makes his light to enter into the mighty boat.
9. Zi-û-sudu the king
10. In the presence of Utu prostrated himself.
11. The king sacrifices an ox, slaughters a sheep,
12. Whilst(?) . . . the great horn . . .
13. . . . he . . . s for him
14. . . .
15. . . . filled it
16. . . . doubled.
17. . . .

(The remainder, about two-thirds of the column, is wanting.)

COLUMN 6.

1. By the soul of heaven, by the soul of earth, ye shall conjure him.
2. that he may be well-disposed with you.'
3. Ana-Enlilla conjured they by the soul of heaven and the soul of earth,
4. and he was well-disposed with them.
5. The root (?) growing from the earth they took up (?).
6. Zi-û-sudu the king
7. Prostrated himself before Ana-Enlilla.
8. Life like a god he gives him—
9. Eternal life like a god he confers upon him.
10. At that time Zi-û-sudu the king
11. Called the name of the root (?) 'seed of mankind'—
12. In another land, the land of Tilmun . . . they made it live.
13. After they had made it live . . .

The remainder of the column—more than two-thirds—is wanting, except that on the left-hand edge of the tablet is a defaced line, in which the editor sees again the name of Zi-û-sudu. From its position, and the ruled line which precedes it, it seems

¹ Or 'against.'

as though it ought to be inserted between lines 7 and 8 of column 6, from which it had apparently been, by error, omitted.

Mutilated though it is, it will easily be recognized that this text is a document of considerable importance. Though written in Sumerian, and exceedingly defective, there is still sufficient that is certain in the record to enable a comparison with the other known Babylonian versions of the Creation and the Flood to be made. In the 11th tablet of the Gilgameš series the great mother-goddess, who laments over the destruction of mankind, whom she had created, is Maḥ, 'the lady of the gods,' Merodach's spouse, also called Nin-tu, 'the lady of reproduction,' and Nin-hursaga, 'the lady of the mountain,' so that the two are in complete accord here. From the opening lines of the 1st column, however, it would seem as though the gods, at the time they, with the help of the goddess, created man and the 'four-limbed beasts of the plain,' had foreseen the advent of the Flood at a later date, and had provided for the revivification of the human race, by placing in the ground the thing which I have doubtfully rendered 'root,' which, later on, the Babylonian Noah, here called Zi-û-sudu, named 'the seed of mankind.'

Apparently time passed on, and men increased both in numbers and in the things which interest and make life worth living. Under the gods, royalty had been instituted with all its pomp and circumstance, as understood in those days, and the sublime commands—of the gods, as we may imagine—had been communicated to men. At this early period five holy cities existed, and were given to rulers whose names do not always appear. The list of cities, however, is interesting, as it includes Éridu (which seems to have been regarded as earth's 'central point,' hence the name applied to it), and a place called 'the fortification of Kis,' which lay about 18 miles N. of Hillah, the modern village representative of ancient Babylon. One would imagine, therefore, that the composer of this poem—for such it is—began by mentioning the most important points in the extreme south and in the north. The third city, Larancha, was probably on the Euphrates, but its site has yet to be identified. The fourth, Sippar, was also in the N., and the fifth, Šuruppak, is the modern Fara, celebrated of old because it was the birthplace or at least the residence of the Babylonian Noah. The Biblical cities, Babel, Erech, Accad, and

Calneh (Gn 10⁹) are entirely wanting. The column ends with the statement that the creating deity provided water-channels for the irrigation of the land, and rain and other water wherewith to fill them.

In the 3rd column we have the account of the great catastrophe of the Flood. In the opening lines the grief of the mother-goddess Nin-tu is strikingly referred to. The completion, making line 15 to state that at that time the goddess 'screamed like a woman in travail,' is that of Poebel, and is based upon the corresponding lines in the Flood story belonging to the 11th tablet of the Gilgameš series, where it is stated that 'Ištar called out like a woman in travail,' and Maḥ, otherwise 'the lady of the gods,' made her voice resound (*Išissi Ištar kima ilīdī, unambi Maḥ ṭābat rigma*, obv. col. iii. 11. 7, 8). As in the Gilgameš version, Enki or Ēa seeks how he may warn mankind of their impending doom, and save at least a few, and he joins with Anu, Enlilla, and the goddess Nin-ḫursagga in invoking the name of Ana-Enlilla, the divine ancestor of Merodach, whose name, as far as the record is preserved, does not occur. It is here that we come across the name of the Babylonian Noah, which is given in Sumerian as Zi-ū-sudu, the Sisuthes of Lucian. It will be remembered that his name, in the Gilgameš legend, appears as Ut-napištim, apparently meaning 'day of life,' and the form in this new version in part agrees with this, as its component parts mean 'life-day-long-abiding,' apparently referring to the gift of immortality conferred on the patriarch after the Flood, when the deity led him forth from the ark.

The lines which follow the first reference to the Babylonian Noah are too mutilated to be entirely satisfactory in their signification, especially as we are unaided by any Semitic translation. Lines 22 to 25, however, are noteworthy as showing (should their rendering be correct) the character of Zi-ū-sudu—piety, reverence, patience, the god's favour in his dreams, conferring the gift of prophecy, and power with the deity owing to his knowledge of invocations and charms. Have we, by chance, in this the key to the meaning of the Biblical name Noah as 'the patient one'? Further discoveries will probably throw light upon this point.

'Life-day-long-remaining,' 'resting,' 'patience,'—all these things seem to go well together, and Zimmern has pointed out to Poebel a very noteworthy variant in *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian*

Tablets, xviii. pl. 30, where, in the left-hand double column, we find that the fourth section is headed by *Zi-suda*, 'extended life,' explained by *Ut-na-PAP-HAL-te*, apparently a fanciful writing of *Ut-na-pa-aš-te*, in which we have a variant of *Ut-napištim* (*-napešti*) with the same meaning, 'day of life.' The Babylonian Noah was the patient one, waiting for the 'day of life,' and the 'day of extended life.' He was also Athra-ḫasis, 'the exceedingly wise,' learned in the wisdom of the gods by his patience, 'daily patiently standing' before his god Enki or Ēa (Cronos), to learn his will, and the things which were to be upon the earth.

In column 4 the opening lines are very uncertain as to their interpretation, but it seems probable that it is the record of a revelation to Zi-ū-sudu, and, as far as it is preserved, it announces the coming of the Flood, and states the name of the deity responsible for it, namely, Ana-Enlilla. In column 5 the coming of the catastrophe is described—the windstorms and the Flood which followed them, and which was apparently directed against or upon the commanders of the cities already referred to. These, it may, perhaps, be supposed, were the sinners against the gods, who, leading their people astray, brought upon them the wrath which was the cause of the infliction. As in the 11th tablet of the Gilgameš series, the Flood lasted seven days and seven nights, and then the sun shone forth again, and its rays entered into the great wind-driven boat. The name given to the parallel to the Biblical ark is noteworthy on account of the adjective added to it—it is not merely ²¹³ *ma = ḫlippu*, 'the ship,' but ²¹³ *ma-gurgur*, 'the great great ship.' This same word occurs in the fragment of another Semitic Babylonian version published by Hilprecht (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May 1910, p. 366), where it occurs under the form ²¹⁴ *ma-gurgur-ru*, translated by the discoverer of the fragment by 'house-boat.' The same text also calls it ²¹⁴ *ḫlippu rabētu*, 'great ship,' 'boat.'

The sun's rays shone in in consequence of Zi-ū-sudu opening something—a window, porthole, or the like. In this rendering I have been influenced by the version in the Gilgameš series, in which, however, a very natural human—and humanitarian—trait is introduced, namely, the patriarch king's grief at seeing the waste of waters and the destruction of mankind which had been wrought. This seems

to be absent in the older Sumerian version now described. The narrative at this point speaks of his prostrating himself (apparently in adoration of the king of light), and the sacrifices which he proceeded to make. Here an ox and a sheep replace the vegetable offerings of the Flood-hero whom Gilgameš journeyed so far to see,

There remains only the 6th and last column, as far as it is preserved. A deity apparently urges them (Zi-û-sudu, his wife, and all those who were with him in the 'mighty boat') to conjure the sender of the Flood, Ana-Enlilla, that he should

be well-disposed towards them. This he does, and Zi-û-sudu receives life—eternal life—like that of a god. After this comes a reference to the things which I have rendered 'roots,' growing in the ground. These the patriarch-king seems to have called 'the seed of mankind,' and they were made to live—how is not stated—in another land, apparently the district called Tilmun, on the shores of the Persian Gulf—practically south and south-western Babylonia, with, possibly, the island of Bahrein, if we accept Oppert's identification.

In the Study.

An Induction Sermon.

BY THE REV. A. F. TAYLOR, M.A., ST. CYRUS.

'Though the Lord give you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy teachers be removed into a corner any more, but thine eyes shall see thy teachers: and thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it.'—Is 30^{20, 21}.

WE are met here on an occasion of very special local interest—the induction of a new pastor over his congregation—but there broods upon all our minds to-day the shadow of a great European crisis and a great national anxiety. I have not found it easy to find a text that should be in harmony with both the particular and the general situation. I have finally selected the verse which I have read to you from the thirtieth chapter of the Book of the Prophet Isaiah.

The prophet Isaiah was a master of phrases. His style is full of vigorous contrasts—contrasts of sound, contrasts of words, contrasts of thought. Contrasts of sound and contrasts of words can scarcely be reproduced in a translation, but contrasts of thought remain in whatsoever language they are rendered, and we have such a contrast of thoughts in this particular text. 'Though the Lord give you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy teachers be removed.' The text sets two things in contrast to one another, and represents the one as in some measure a compensation for the other—and some people may think it a very inadequate compensation. The words have the appearance and promise of comfort, but the comfort is of a somewhat

elusive kind. One can understand the comfort of such words as, I will give you deliverance from your enemies, or relief from your suffering, or rest from your fear; or even of the Apostle Paul's assurance that the afflictions and troubles of this present life will find an adequate compensation in the joy and glory of the life to come. But this surely is strange comfort anyway, 'Though the Lord give you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy teachers (or preachers) be removed.'

I would have you note, first, the vigorous nature of the metaphor. *Bread* and *water* are the daily necessities of life. It is almost as if the prophet had said, 'Though adversity and affliction be with you every day of your lives, so that you seem almost to feed on them, yet you need not be discouraged. There is compensation; and the compensation is this, that your teachers, or preachers, will still be with you.' Curiously enough, the prophet Amos uses the same metaphor, and the same contrast of thought, but in a different way—as embodying not a message of comfort, but a message of warning. 'Behold,' he says, 'I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but a famine of hearing the words of the Lord . . . and they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord, and shall not find it.' It is just as if he had said, There are worse things that can happen to a people even than the terror of famine, and that is, that they should not be able to hear any word of the Lord for the comfort and strengthening of their souls. So here the prophet says, Even in

the midst of national anxiety, peril, and disaster, no people need despair if there are still among them those who can speak some message of God to their souls. Of course there are some people to whom this word-promise will not appeal. That which the word specifies as one of the good and gracious things which may sustain the national life in the midst of adversity will not appear to them to be any great comfort or any adequate compensation.* But just herein lies the freshness and boldness of the metaphor. Who but a man of genius, who but a man who was conscious of the moral momentum and persuasiveness he was able to put into his words, would have dared to offer the people such an apparently illusive comfort as this? 'Though the Lord give you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy preachers be removed.' 'Poor comfort!' one may say, 'for who are my preachers? and what help worth speaking of can they give me in the time of trouble?' "The heart knoweth its own bitterness; and a stranger intermeddleth not with its joy." I must eat the bread of adversity alone, and I must drink the water of affliction alone. Money may help me if I am poor; a strong arm may help me if I am in peril; a physician may help me in the hour of sickness, but what can the preacher do for me anyway? Will words discharge my debt, or frighten my foe, or heal me of my sickness? How are these two things to come into touch with one another—poverty and peril and sickness, so real and so pungent, and on the other side words—mere words! Miserable comforters are ye all!

And yet there is a deep, an abiding, and a marvellous truth in this message of the prophet; for, after all, the spiritual compensations of life are the only adequate ones, for through them, however the body may suffer, the soul still triumphs!

Of course the difficulty of realizing the full comfort of this message lies in the fact that the actual or professional teacher, or preacher, falls often so far short of the ideal. After all, there are but few preachers who actually *are* all that the ideal preacher has it in him to be. One or two great lights there are in every generation, whether we call them prophets, philosophers, or poets; some lesser lights that may still be accounted great; lesser still in diminishing degree until we come down to those whose light is so feeble that it is almost a mockery to call them lights, forces, or

powers at all. The greater lights are men whose names will live for ever—Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Apostle Paul, Wycliffe and Luther, Knox and Wesley and Chalmers; the lesser lights are the ephemerally popular preachers, serviceable in their own day and generation, but not remembered beyond it; and so down by degrees we come to those who are still preachers in name, but in whose voices there is no ring of conviction, in whose thoughts there is no light, in whose message there is no power to comfort or inspire. I speak feelingly, as every preacher must who is conscious how far his own actual service falls below the ideal.

'Though the Lord give you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy teachers be removed'—a high ideal of the preacher's office lies behind these words, and it is only if we turn our thoughts away from the actual and professional preacher, and fix them on the preacher God-given and God-endowed, that we feel the full truth of them. But what an inestimable boon such a God-given and God-endowed teacher is! How he grips his generation and lifts it out of lethargy and despair! How he arouses men to new efforts, and awakens them to new interests, and imparts fresh zest to their lives! He *is* some compensation to a people in the time of their adversity and affliction, for it is just in such times that he comes to his own, and often enough he transforms a nation's adversity and affliction into glory and honour. It is almost impossible to overstate what one man may be to the generation to whom God has sent him. No greater boon can come to any nation than that there should be ever with them some man of God to strengthen them in adversity or guide their counsels in the time of peace!

Such a man was the prophet Isaiah himself. Those were days of terrible anxiety in Jerusalem when he lived, and had it not been for him they might have been days of terrible disaster also. Had it not been for Isaiah the fate of Jerusalem might have been like that of Samaria, which, crushed by the might of Assyria, never again raised its head. Such men also were Wycliffe and Luther, Knox and Wesley and Chalmers. The ideal preacher is a captain and leader of men, moulder of their thoughts and inspirer of their feelings, from which all their actions spring. He may not immediately and literally be able to deliver a people from their adversity. He cannot blow away an

army like the legendary Elisha; but he can stand by a people in the midst of their adversity, delivering them from cowardice, inspiring them with courage, confidence, and hope. Adversity and affliction are very sore experiences of life, but, if they should befall us, it is much indeed if we may be strengthened and inspired to bear them manfully and go bravely through with the work of life in spite of them.

There are thousands of young men everywhere crying for some one to teach them, to be the master of their thoughts, and to lead them in the ways of the higher and nobler life. Let but the true God-given and God-endowed preacher appear, and choice souls will gather round him, be they few or many; and it is a wonderful thing indeed that even those who can lay no claim to exceptional gifts of learning, eloquence, or force are yet permitted to bear their part in this great ministry of comfort and inspiration. If we ministers have felt discouraged sometimes by the thought of how little we seem to be able to help or influence those round about us, have we not also been surprised sometimes to know that some word of ours has indeed brought strength or comfort to a frail or suffering soul?

Let me close with a word of comfort to my brethren in the ministry. Knowing what I myself have felt, I know what you have felt also. I know that many of you, my brethren, have often felt discouraged and sometimes, perhaps, even depressed. You know, indeed, that you have a message, but often enough utterance seems to be denied you—at least such utterance, powerful and persuasive, as you would wish to achieve. Let me then remind you that things are to be valued according to their nature, not merely according to their magnitude. Whatever raised to its highest power is manifestly able to exert an *enormous* influence, must be able to exercise *some* influence even at its lowest power. The sun illuminates the whole solar system, but that very fact implies that a candle flame may illuminate a room. We must not allow ourselves to think or feel that our ministry or service is of no account because it is not of as great account as we should wish it to be, or as some other man's apparently is.

At the beginning of the complete edition of Wordsworth's poems (at least of my edition) there stands as preface to the whole a Sonnet in which I myself have often found comfort and which,

with the omission of a single word, I hand on to you:

If thou indeed derive thy light from Heaven,
Then, to the measure of that heaven-born light,
Shine—in thy place, and be content :—
The stars pre-eminent in magnitude,
And they that from the zenith dart their beams,
(Visible though they be to half the earth,
Though half a sphere be conscious of their brightness)
Are yet of no diviner origin,
No purer essence, than the one that burns,
Like an untended watchfire, on the ridge
Of some dark mountain; or than those which seem
Humbly to hang, like twinkling winter lamps,
Among the branches of the leafless trees;
All are the undying offspring of one Sire :
Then, to the measure of the light vouchsafed,
Shine—in thy place, and be content !

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

August.

‘Behold a basket of summer fruit.’—Amⁱ8ⁱ.

If any of you children chanced to go to Ayrshire in the summer-time, and found yourselves near a place called Alloway, you would meet tourists from all over the world, and see them, not only lingering by the banks of the river Doon, but trying to get a glimpse of a real Scottish ploughman. The explanation of this is, that there was once a ploughman lived in the neighbourhood whose name was Robert Burns. He was a man who had visions. He could not even see a wild daisy growing without dreaming about it, and his mind becoming filled with beautiful thoughts. When he wrote these thoughts down, they seemed just full of music. Ever since his death, people have spoken of Robert Burns as the greatest of Scottish poets. Then France had a wonderful painter called Millet. He also came of humble peasant folk, and his pictures make one feel sure that there must be something pure and lovely about the character of the French peasantry.

Sometimes I think that town children miss a great deal by not coming more into contact with the people who live always in the country and whose men-folk plough the fields and take care of the sheep; their lives are so full of interest, and they themselves often so good. The Prophet Amos was just a farm labourer. According to his own description he was a herdsman and a

dresser of sycamore trees, which means that he tended the sheep and the goats and took care of the sycamore fruit. In the course of his day's work, he naturally had many opportunities of learning nature's secrets and hearing God speak. One day there came to him the command of the Lord to go and tell the people of Israel about their sins. And Amos went. Think of this plain man of the hills appearing amongst those who thought themselves very great and also very 'grand.' Amos, the herdsman, might seem rugged and uncouth, but you may be sure that his straight simple words arrested the attention of his listeners.

He took pictures from his outdoor life to enforce his arguments. Once a vision came to him: 'A basket of summer fruit.' That sounds nice, doesn't it? I know that the thoughts of you boys and girls turn at once to strawberries, raspberries, and plums that have a beautiful fresh bloom upon them. But to Amos this vision did not speak of the lusciousness of ripe summer fruit, but of its decay. Probably there appeared to him just the common fruit amongst which he worked every day during the whole fruit season—the fig of the sycamore tree. It was one of those fruits that have to be eaten as soon as they are plucked. You know how soon even strawberries and raspberries lose their flavour when off the bushes.

The sycamore fig of Palestine was a most peculiar growth. An interesting writer and preacher tells us that it grew, not from the branches, but from the trunk of the tree, and on short stems. In order to produce this fruit, the part of the tree where it budded required to have a cut or wound made in it. From this wound or opening a bud sprang up, which grew and formed the fruit. Then when the fruit was nearly ripe, it required to be punctured, or to have what is called its 'eye' removed, for the fig was infested with an insect that gave it a bad taste. When the 'eye' or top was cut off, the insect escaped and the fruit then became sweet. Now, boys and girls, try to remember that the sycamore fig originated in a wound, and was made sweet by a wound. It was altogether an unnatural growth.

The vision of the ripe sycamore figs brought to Amos a message of judgment for Israel. It is right that your dream of 'a basket of summer fruit' should bring only thoughts of joy. God meant it to be so. For those of you who cannot have baskets of strawberries or raspberries He

has made a lovely fruit garden. It is out in the country, in the woods, and by the waysides. With some children I have known, summer reached its fullest glory only when there came a day of gathering ripe wild fruit. You love colour, I know. You like the field flowers. But what happiness is to be compared with that of spending a day in the woods, or of wandering for hours amongst hedges, and at night going home with baskets full of Nature's good things? You don't all carry baskets, I know. I have met many a merry party returning from gathering blaberries. The shy, happy smile, the little black mouths, and the flagons told me what they had been about.

Last month, walking through a wood, I noticed the blaberries ripening, and I could not help thinking of God's goodness. The bushes grew amidst the softest of mossy carpets, and little flowers peeped up here and there, as if laughing to see a grown person trying to find a ripe bla-berry in early July. I was trespassing in the children's garden. Whatever be the sorrows in the world, God does not forget you, my boys and girls. He gives you many things to make you happy, amongst them the 'basket of summer fruit.'

When Amos delivered his terrible message, he was looking back over the story of a nation that had sinned. You are looking forward. Your 'basket of summer fruit'—does it speak to you of anything beyond the mere joy of eating it?

Many years ago, a girl went bla-berrying with her brother. The wood was a long way from where they lived, and a schoolboy companion asked them to go to his home for tea. This boy's father was a crofter. What a quaint old house the girl was taken to. She looked up and saw the rafters in the kitchen. They were quite black. At first, she wondered if she could enjoy her tea. Of course she did, and that very much. Afterwards, quite a number of people came into the kitchen, and seated themselves in a circle. Bibles were handed round, then a psalm was sung to a very old-fashioned tune. After that came a chapter from the Bible—read verse about. Some of the readers read like little children: you know what I mean. Lastly, they all knelt down and an old grandfather prayed.

On the way home, the girl felt that her day at 'the bla-berryes' had somehow not been quite so full of fun as usual. Now, when she is old and has forgotten the sweetness of the wild fruit, she

looks back on that Saturday as one of the happiest in her life. There was sunshine, there were flowers; and her visit to the crofter's cottage made her think of God. The sycamore fruit was an unnatural growth: so too was the wickedness of Israel. They were God's children and had forgotten it; thus their happiness and prosperity could—like the sweetness of the figs—endure only for a moment. Take then your 'basket of summer fruit,' my boys and girls, with God's blessing. Remember you are His children, and that He is caring for you. His goodness 'endureth for ever.'

II.

Like to Like.

'And being let go, they went to their own company.'—Ac 4²³ (A.V.).

Who were the men who 'went to their own company'? They were Peter and John, the disciples of Jesus. Peter, who was accompanied by John, had healed a lame man who lay at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple, and the event had caused great excitement among the people. Now you know what happens in our own towns when anything unusual occurs—a big crowd gathers. It was just the same in Jerusalem. The people ran together to see what was the matter, and I wouldn't be a bit surprised to learn that there were a very great number of small boys in that crowd. Peter began to speak to the people about how they had crucified Christ and how He had risen again, and many of them were won over to the side of Jesus. But when the priests heard about it, they were very much alarmed, so they shut up Peter and John in prison for the night. The following morning the rulers and elders and scribes had Peter and John brought into their midst, and they tried to get them to promise not to speak any more to the people. But when the disciples refused to do this, the council, after threatening them, let them go, for they were afraid of the people. And, Peter and John being let go, 'went to their own company.'

Who were the companions to whom Peter and John went? They were also disciples of Jesus, and the next few verses let us see what kind of men they were. They were good men, and they were brave men, praying that they might still have boldness to speak the word in spite of the threats that had been made.

Do you know that if we had learned nothing more about Peter and John than what is told us in our text, and what we read about the company to which they joined themselves, we could still have told what kind of men they were. Now I wonder how that is? Well, it's just like this. Men and women, boys and girls, too, are known by the company they choose, when they are free to choose. If we had been told what kind of company Peter and John had in prison, we wouldn't have known a bit more what kind of men they were themselves. Very likely they had beside them robbers and murderers, but that didn't mean that *they* were robbers and murderers. Their companions were chosen for them. But as soon as they were free they went to the companions they had chosen themselves, and people do not choose companions unless they like them and have something in common with them.

You will find that you are judged by the company you keep, by the friends you choose. Have you ever heard the story of the farmer who had a pet parrot? One day he lost his parrot. Search was made everywhere but Polly could not be found. A few days later the farmer set out to shoot some crows who were damaging his crops. He hid himself behind a hedge and took aim, and then went to see how many crows had been killed. Lying beside the dead crows he found his favourite parrot, one wing broken by the shot. And when he picked it up, what do you think it said? 'Bad company; bad company!'

Yes, it was bad company that had brought Polly to this sad pass; and remember, if you are found amongst the crows, you will be taken for a crow; if you company with bad boys and girls, you will be thought to be one of them.

Now if somebody were to come to me and ask me about one of you, 'What kind of boy is that?' or, 'What do you think of that girl?' I should say to them, 'Will you give me a few days to find out, and then I will tell you?' Of course I should have to put on a sort of invisible cap, because if you knew I were watching you, you would be a different kind of boy or girl—not the real boy or girl. Well, suppose I had on my invisible cap and set out to watch you, where do you think I should go? Perhaps you imagine I should follow you into school and stand behind your form, or sit on your desk to see how you did your lessons. Oh dear no, I shouldn't think of wasting time.

over that. I should know that while you are in school you have to keep to certain rules and do certain things—you are just one of a crowd who have to keep these same rules and do these same things. So while you were in school I should take a little nap to prepare me for the hard work I should have later on.

But when school hours were over, when you were 'let go,' I should stand beside the door and watch you coming out; I should follow you to the playground and notice what kind of games you played, and how you played them. I should notice what sort of temper you showed at games, whether you played fair, and whether you gave the other boy credit for playing fair. I should follow you on the way home. I should notice the groups you broke up into—who were your chums. Then when your lessons were learned in the evening and your books put away, I should watch how you employed your spare time.

Here is a boy or girl who makes for a book and sits down to devour it quite oblivious of all that is going on around. It is not difficult to tell what sort of young people they are. Here are others who get out their cricket bat or their tennis racquet—they are fond of games. Here is a boy who gets hold of his tools and starts whittling and hammering at something. He has a taste for engineering. Here is a girl who likes to bake things or sew things. She is going to be a good housewife. Here is another girl who gets out her paint-box and her pencil. She has a love for art. Here is a boy who goes out and hangs about the street idle. He is in danger of getting into serious mischief and making a mess of his life. Here is a girl who is so tired of everything, and thinks there is nothing nice to do. She is laying the foundations of an unhappy nature, and if she doesn't pull herself together, she will turn out a bore to herself and her friends.

Yes, it isn't how we behave when we are being watched and held in that shows what we really are: it is the company we choose when we are free—the company of things and of people: it is the way we act when nobody is watching. Are we just as straight and upright behind our mothers' and fathers' backs as we would be if they were looking on?

There is a story of an American statesman who lost his wife, and on her tombstone he had these words carved: 'Sacred to the memory of Jocelyn,

wife of J. Sterling Morton and mother of Paul, Mark, and Joy Morton.' One day a friend who had seen the tombstone remarked on the strangeness of the inscription, and asked Mr. Morton why he had had the boys' names put there. And what do you think the statesman replied? 'I have taken my boys to see the tombstone, and I have told them that if one of them does anything to dishonour his mother's memory I will have that one's name chiselled off the stone.' I think those boys would be very careful always to be honourable, and clean, and true. I think they would be anxious never to do anything mean or unworthy. And I think it is a splendid rule for all of us, whether they are with us still, or whether they are waiting for us in our Home above—never to do anything, anywhere, of which our mothers would be ashamed.

III.

The Enchantment of Sin.

'Ye will not come to me that ye may have life.'—Jn 5⁴⁰.

In the book called *The Faerie Queene* is told the tale of the quest of Sir Guyon. The story tells that the Faerie Queen had a feast every year for twelve days. All her brave knights were in attendance at the court, and people who had suffered any injury came and begged for help against the wicked fairies or witches, or dragons who had done them harm, and the Faerie Queen sent her knights to redress their wrongs, to slay the dragon, or the magician, or whatever else was needed. At one of these feasts an old palmer appeared. He was dressed in black, and carried a long staff in his hand. He had come to complain of the doings of a wicked witch called Acrasia, who did many evil things in his country. There was at the feast a brave handsome knight, named Guyon, and to him the Queen gave the task of going with the palmer, to save his country from the enchantress. So they set out together, and met with many adventures by the way. They came to a sea which they had to cross, and got a boat and a boatman to take them over. For some days they rowed on past great sea monsters, and enchanted islands, and at last they drew near to the land where Acrasia lived. Then Guyon got his arms ready; and as soon as they touched the shore, he took the palmer with him as his guide, and set out to find the witch. Savage beasts came rushing and roar-

ing at them, but when the palmer waved his staff they slunk away. On they went till they reached a beautiful ivory palace. A young man at the gate offered them wine, but they would not drink it. They went through lovely gardens, gay with flowers, and fountains, and ringing with the song of birds. A beautiful lady wished to persuade them to drink the grape juice which she squeezed into a cup for them, but Guyon dashed the cup to the ground, and pressed on till he found the witch lying on a bed of red roses. Creeping softly up, he flung a net over her, and made her a captive. Then he destroyed her palace that it might entice no one else, and led her away a prisoner to the boat. As they went the savage beasts came rushing at them again, but the palmer touched them with his staff, and lo! they were changed into men. They had all been men once, but had been turned into beasts by the power of the wicked witch. For the wicked witch is just Sin, who makes men like beasts, when they listen to her tempting songs and taste the wine she offers them. Some of the men looked angry when they saw the witch a prisoner, and some were full of shame for their past conduct, but all were glad for being delivered. All, indeed, except one. His name was Grille, and he had been changed into a pig. He had been a pig so long that he had grown used to it, and could not think of anything better. So he only grunted in a discontented way, and said, 'Why did you not leave me alone? I *wish* to be a pig. It is far better to be a pig than a man. There are plenty of roots and acorns here, and nice mud to roll in. What more do I want?' Sir Guyon was very much surprised at his ingratitude and said,

'See the mind of beastly man,
That hath so soone forgot the excellence
Of his creation, when he life began,
That now he chooseth with vile difference
To be a beast, and lacke intelligence.'

Then the palmer said,

'Let Grille be Grille, and have his hoggish
mind:
But let us hence depart, whilst weather serves
and wind.'

So the good old man touched him again, and changed him back. Then the boat sailed away and carried Guyon and the palmer back to the palace of the Faerie Queen, the men who had been

restored went back to their own homes, and Grille was left to root and grub to his heart's content.

Now that was a choice to make! He liked being a pig! You may have heard of some one who was as greedy as a pig, or as lazy, or as dirty, or as obstinate as a pig, but nobody likes being compared to a pig, much less being one. There was a time when Grille did not like it either, when he thought his heart was broken because he knew he had become a pig; but that was so long ago that he had quite forgotten it, and now he would not be anything else though he had the chance.

Of course you don't mean to grow up lazy and greedy and obstinate. Then take care. Now, while you are young, is the time to form your habits. You are shaping your character now, and it will not be easy to change it afterwards. You are growing like your companions, whether you choose good or bad ones. You are filling your minds with pure thoughts from good books, or with bad things from trashy papers. Perhaps you are giving in to what you know is wrong, instead of fighting against it. If it is pleasant you have not courage to refuse it, as Sir Guyon dashed down the enchanted wine that was offered him. All these things are making your future character. You are *changing yourself* into something, and time will show what it will be. So when people point out faults to you, and advise you not to get into bad habits, you should be grateful, and try to put them right. How sad it would be if you made yourself into a growling bear, or a sneaking fox, or a coarse groveling pig. It would take more than the touch of a magician's wand to undo it. Worst of all, there will come a time when you do not wish to change. It is too much trouble. You had rather be a pig!

Missionaries in the poor parts of our cities say that the most hopeful part of their work is among the children, because their character is not yet formed, and they may, when they see what is good, follow it, and grow up good men and women. When people have become accustomed to sinful habits, it is very very difficult to help them. They cannot change themselves, and they have lost the wish to be changed.

There is only One who can change people back from the sad shapes they have made for themselves—the Saviour of the world. Even He cannot do it against their will. He grieved over the city of Jerusalem, and said, 'O Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth

gather her brood under her wings, and ye *would not!*' And again He said to the people of Jerusalem, 'Ye *will not come* unto me, that ye may have life.' He offered them salvation from their sins, and life with Him in heaven for ever. He begged them to take it but they would not have it, and He could not give it to them against their will.

You are made in the image of God, will you not give Him your hearts to keep now, before sin has laid its spell upon them, lest it should change you into its own ugliness, and you should be content, and forget what God meant you to be—His dear children?

IV.

Look Straight Ahead.

The Rev. E. W. Shephard-Walwyn has published a volume of Talks with Boys and Boy Scouts, under the title of *Look Straight Ahead* (Allenson; rs. 6d. net). We shall quote the talk that gives the book its title:—

A boy went to learn farming. The first morning he was taken out to see how ploughing was done. He said:

'Any silly can do that. All you've got to do is to hold the handles, and the horse does the work.'

So the farmer let him try. The line went all crooked, and he felt very sheepish.

'What were you looking at when you ploughed?' his master asked him.

'Looking at?—er—I was watching the funny things the plough turned up, beetles and crooked stones,' he said.

'Exactly. Look at something *on ahead*—that tall bit in the hedge, for instance.'

So he tried again.

The second time the line went all over the place.

'There now! I looked at something in front,' said the boy.

'What did you look at?' asked the farmer.

'Well—er—there was a cow fooling about in front of me.'

'And you looked at that? Silly boy. Look at a *stationary object*, something that doesn't move, I told you—that little tree in the hedge.'

So he learnt to plough at last.

You boys have a long line to plough through the world. If you look *near* at hand, I mean, at yourself, you will make a mess of it.

Looking on oneself too highly, *i.e.* being cocksure and conceited; or looking on oneself too lowly, *i.e.* being downhearted—both result in crooked lines.

Looking at the cow is like copying good people. They make mistakes. The cow was first here then there. 'So 'good' people make mistakes. They do a 'good' thing one day, and something not so good another day.

Some quite kind men and women are making most serious mistakes, for instance, about Sunday, and are letting the boys have their week-day fun on God's day, so that they may not be 'dull.'

So, never say, 'It must be all right to do that, because so-and-so does it, who is *such* a nice person.' Else you will plough your own line all crooked. The eleventh chapter of Hebrews tells about a lot of good men of the Old Testament, Abraham, David, Samuel, etc.

Then chapter 12 begins: '*Seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses (i.e. all these 'good people' watching us from the other world), let us run with patience the race (or plough the line) that is set before us, looking unto ———.*'

Well, you would think that, having filled a whole chapter with talking about these 'good people' of the Old Testament, it is surely going to say, 'Looking unto *them*,' as examples. But it deliberately leaves the whole lot out, and puts another name—'*Jesus.*'

He is the 'stationary object,' the 'same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.' If you put Him up in front of you, you will always plough straight.

If you think how He used to speak to His mother, and the kind of books He was likely to have been fond of reading, then all your own words to your mother will be kind and manly, and you will never read anything you will afterwards struggle in vain to forget.

Some, when they are rude, say, 'Oh, it's only in fun.' They have not looked hard enough at Jesus Christ to *see* what a smudgy thing rudeness is.

Others will tell a lie, and say, 'It's only a green one.' They have not looked hard enough at Jesus to see that all lies are black, none are 'white' or 'green.'

The Lord Jesus first ploughed the line Himself through life without a mistake, and has been standing at the end of it ever since, and is beckoning

you on with His wounded hand to follow in His steps. If you could catch but a glimpse of the love in His eyes as He watches you, it would then be easy to go on trying, and not to be discouraged in the Christian life. For His eyes have the most amazing power in them. They can draw you

through any difficulty, and out of anything bad you ever get into. But you must give proper time, in your prayers, and on Sunday, to get a look right into His eyes. A hurried look is no use, as then your look and His *haven't time to get clinched together.*

The Pioneer of Faith and of Salvation.

A STUDY OF THE PERSONAL EXPERIENCE OF JESUS AS PRESENTED IN
THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

BY THE REV. ALFRED E. GARVIE, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

I.

1. ONE of the objects of the religious-historical school, which it pursues with great ingenuity and industry, is to *correlate* Christianity with other religions, to minimize its originality and to magnify its borrowings. Much is made of the dependence of the Fourth Gospel on Philo, of Paul on Stoicism or the mystery-cults, of the Epistle to the Hebrews on the Platonic doctrine of ideas, and even of Jesus on Jewish Apocalyptic. It is no interest of Christian theology to deny altogether any of these connexions; but it is its duty to challenge the too exclusive attention given to these relations, and so the disproportionate impression made of their influence. It is in the moral and religious realm that the uniqueness of Christianity lies; and the reality of the personal experiences of believers, dependent on, and reproductive of, the personal experience of Jesus, is the absolutely original contribution of Christianity to the religious and moral life of mankind. This reality transforms, and so invests with fresh meaning and new worth, any elements of religion or morals which, as an organism affected by its environment, the Christian faith may have borrowed; and it is its assimilation of what seem foreign elements that is a proof of its vitality.

2. Applying these general considerations to the Epistle to the Hebrews, we may observe (i.) how the Platonic contrast between reality and appearance, the heavenly substance and the earthly shadow, is resolved into unity in the personal experience of Jesus, and (ii.) how the personal experience of Jesus is the source and the pattern of

the personal experience of believers, so that they too, even as He, have risen above that contrast. He who is the Pioneer of their salvation (2¹⁰) is also the pioneer of their faith (12²); and through faith in Him, who is 'the effulgence of God's glory, and the very impress of his substance' (*ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ*, 1⁸), they possess the assurance of things hoped for, the proving of things not seen (*ἐλπίζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων*, 11¹). The disparagement of the image in comparison with the idea, characteristic of Platonism, the author of Hebrews does pronounce regarding the whole Levitical ritual system; but the salvation and the sacrifice of Christ do not belong to the inferior earthly order, but to the perfect heavenly order; and here man is in contact not with transitory appearance, but with eternal reality. We may apply to his standpoint Rothe's declaration that *the ethical is the ontological*. The author is the master and not the slave of the philosophy he uses for his own purpose.

3. While a false and wrong use was made of the distinction between the religion of Jesus and the Christian religion in order to depreciate the latter in comparison with the former, yet Christian theologians have made a profound mistake who, to assert the claim of the second, have ignored the worth of the first. Christ Jesus is both the object and the subject of faith, and He is the one only because He is the other; in His own sacrifice He realized the salvation which the believer receives from Him. We can escape an intolerable legalism, formalism, and externalism in dealing with this doctrine of the

Atonement only as we cease regarding it as a solitary, mysterious transaction between Christ and God, which has no analogy in the moral and religious experience of man; and we can make the doctrine intelligible and credible only as we interpret it, not only as a personal experience of Jesus, but as an experience of so typical and universal a character that it is to be reproduced in the believer. What Christ has done *for us* on His Cross is to be again done *in us* by the Spirit. Any doctrine of substitution is a legal fiction only, if it is not interpreted as a self-identification of Christ with man in grace, and of man with Christ in faith. Evangelicalism will never bully men, as is the manner of some of its representatives, into the acceptance of a doctrine which does not win them by its convincing, commanding moral and religious reality.

4. Herrmann in his religious classic, *The Communion of the Christian with God*, makes the 'inner life' of Jesus the power of God unto salvation; and the concentration of the interest of the Apostolic Age on the death and the rising again of Jesus does not justify any modern writer in his disparagement of 'the Synoptic Figure.' By the study of the 'inner life' of Jesus as thus disclosed (as also in the Fourth Gospel) we can learn much as to His relation to God and to man which gives an intelligible content to this sacrifice as not only the source but also the type of His salvation for men. And it is this that seems to me the most promising development in modern theology. In what has been called Paul's *faith mysticism* there is presented a close analogy between the experience of the Saviour and the Saved; our salvation consists in our having been crucified and having been raised to newness of life in Him (Ro 6¹⁻¹¹). It is a curious theological ineptitude which, instead of re-interpreting the previous chapters from this fresh standpoint, would resolve this vital into that legal conception. But Paul does not deal closely enough with the 'inner life' of Jesus to give full content to his own analogy. This the author of *Hebrews* has done; and it is in his interpretation of the Atonement from the standpoint of Jesus' personal experience that he has made his most valuable contribution to our understanding of the truth and grace of Christ.

II.

1. In attempting a study of the several passages in which the personal experience of Jesus is dealt

with, we may first of all discuss the proofs he offers of the reality of the humanity of Jesus in 2¹²⁻¹³. At first sight the quotations from the Old Testament may seem arbitrary illustrations of the artificial exegetical methods then current; but if we study more closely the passages in their original context, and in the context given to them, that impression will be removed. It is not the word *brethren* in the first quotation, nor the word *children* in the third that asserts the link of a common humanity between Jesus and men: but each of these quotations relates to a personal experience, and it is such a personal experience that is quite unequivocally asserted in the second quotation. The first quotation, 'I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the congregation will I sing thy praise,' is taken from Ps 22²², the same psalm as gave Jesus the words in which He uttered His desolation of soul (v.¹). What the psalmist expresses his intention of declaring is the deliverance which God will accomplish for him; and the word *brethren* surely points, not to a common physical nature only, but to a common personal experience. While the former is the necessary condition of the latter; and the author of *Hebrews*, as the phrase 'blood and flesh' in v.¹⁴ shows, has the one in view, he does not, owing to the close connexion, exclude the other. The next quotation, 'I will put my trust in him,' is probably derived from Is 8¹⁷ (LXX); and it asserts the prophet's continued dependence on and confidence in God, even although He is hiding 'His face from the house of Jacob.' If we complete the next quotation, 'Behold, I and the children which God hath given me,' by the words following, 'are for signs and for wonders in Israel from the Lord of hosts, which dwelleth in mount Zion' (v.¹⁸), and recall that the prophet's own name and the names he gave his children were significant of God's dealings with His people, we find ourselves in the same atmosphere of moral and religious and not merely physical reality. It is a common personal experience in relation to God, and not only a common physical nature from God, that is the bond of union between Christ and mankind. The unity is that of *the sanctifier* and *the sanctified* (v.¹¹), and this implies more than, although it must include, common *blood and flesh*. Again, the declaration in the v.¹⁶, 'For verily not of angels doth he take hold, but he taketh hold of the seed of Abraham,' even if

ἐπὶ λαὸν βάνεται has not the fuller meaning of 'layeth hold to help,' need not refer exclusively to physical descent from Abraham, but may and probably does, include likeness in faith, as in Gal 3⁷, 'They which be of faith, the same are sons of Abraham.'

2. This line of interpretation is confirmed by the part assigned both to God and to Christ in this process of sanctification. (i.) There seems to be little doubt that the reference in the phrase ἐξ ἑνός is to God, and neither to Adam nor to Abraham, as the common ancestor either of mankind or of the chosen people. God has one purpose, and accordingly also one method in *Him that sanctifieth* and in *them that are sanctified*. *The many sons in being brought to glory are perfected through suffering*: and so it is in accord with the divine method of dealing that the pioneer of salvation should pass through the same experience (v.¹⁰). This interpretation gives a much fuller content to the phrase than if it meant only that God assigned to *sanctifier* and *sanctified* the same physical nature. (ii.) The clause 'he is not ashamed' as applied to Christ has also fuller value, if it means not merely the assumption in the Incarnation of a human nature, but the voluntary participation in all human experience. It is said of the *Pioneer of faith* that in enduring the cross, He despised shame (12²); and probably in the present passage there is a similar reference, as the entire context is concerned, not merely with the human nature, but particularly with the human experience of Christ. Father and Son alike willed the In-

carnation as a complete self-identification with distinctive human experience.

3. In insisting on this view we are simply affirming the standpoint from which all the references in this Epistle to the life and work of Christ are to be understood. Because this is its standpoint the Epistle is of so great value as a challenge of the sacerdotal and sacramentarian position. The Epistle does speak of priesthood and sacrifice, but only to assert the valuelessness of any official priesthood and any material sacrifice, and to substitute for them the priesthood of character perfected by experience, and the sacrifice of sympathy with man, and obedience to God. No objection could be taken to the tendency to emphasize the fact of Incarnation as central to Christianity, if incarnation were not represented as a physical process in itself through sacramental channels valuable and efficacious for man's salvation, but always as a moral and religious experience, even as it is represented in this Epistle. The atonement of God and man is not in the union in one person of human and divine natures, but in the genuinely and intensely human experience of the Son of God, His liability to temptation, His subjection to suffering, His exercise of obedience and sympathy, His endurance of all that may be involved in death. If this is what is significant and valuable in the Incarnation, its benefits will be conveyed to man, not by the material channels of sacraments, but by the spiritual channels of His grace and man's faith.

Literature.

HENRY FAWCETT.

PUT the right biography into the hands of one whose face is turned to life and there is nothing better that you can do. Put the biography of Henry Fawcett into his hands. If Sir Leslie Stephen's is too large, take Winifred Holt's. Its title is *A Beacon for the Blind* (Constable; 7s. 6d. net). We are all blind, though not in the sense in which Henry Fawcett was blind. We are blind to truth and sympathy and sacrifice. And the value of the biography of Henry Fawcett lies in this, that where we are blind, he was clear-sighted.

The story of his life is told simply and yet

enthusiastically. A noble life it was, and the very reading of it, even the re-reading of it in this pleasant way, is uplifting. There is humour too. For Fawcett was an all-round man, with a weakness for political economy. The following anecdote refers to the time when he was a Fellow of Trinity College, before he was made a Professor and long before he became Postmaster-General.

'Such was the reputation for extreme opinions Fawcett and Stephen had given by their connection with Trinity Hall, that a certain country squire of ancient lineage and Conservative principles hesitated whether he dared send his son to the college where his ancestors had gained their learn-

ing. He decided to visit Cambridge, and there interviewed Stephen and Fawcett. He told them with unfeigned horror of the serious charges of Radicalism against the college that made him afraid to entrust his son to its keeping. The grave Fellows compared notes solemnly before answering the father, then Fawcett reassured him, saying that the rumours which he had heard had been much exaggerated, and though at one time "some of us had been rather infected with extreme opinions, now we have greatly moderated our views, and shall be content simply with the Disestablishment of the Church and the abolition of the Throne."

ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL.

St. Matthew's Gospel, till lately much neglected by the commentator, is now well furnished with scholarly commentaries. First came Archdeacon Allen's in the 'International Critical' Series. Dr. Plummer's rather more popular and expository work followed. And now we have *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, the Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices, by Alan Hugh M'Neile, D.D. (Macmillan; 15s.).

Dr. M'Neile offers a short introduction—for the shortness of which he hopes to receive the gratitude of his readers. The space thus saved he uses for Additional Notes. This is the chief feature of the book. It contains thirty-two Additional Notes, in which special difficulties of text, or interpretation, or criticism, or theology are separately discussed. And it may be said confidently that no part of the book is better done or more acceptable. We shall look at two of these Additional Notes.

But before doing so, we may say that the ordinary notes have all the qualities of the best Cambridge work. It is probable that Messrs. Macmillan have still before them the idea of offering commentaries on all the books of the New Testament, in order to complete the scheme started by Lightfoot and Westcott and Hort. If so, this may be reckoned a step towards its fulfilment. The very binding corresponds with Lightfoot's *Colossians* and Westcott's *Hebrews*. And the notes have the same accuracy and independence that marked the work of the three famous Cambridge scholars.

It may be useful to name the commentaries now published in this form. They are M'Neile's *St.*

Matthew; Swetes' *St. Mark*; Lightfoot's *Galatians*, *Philippians*, *Colossians* and *Philemon*; Robinson's *Ephesians*; Milligan's *Thessalonians*; Westcott's *Hebrews*, and the *Epistles of St. John*; Mayor's *St. James*, and *Jude and II. Peter*; Swete's *Apocalypse*.

The subjects separately discussed by Dr. M'Neile which we wish to look at are the Virgin Birth and the Transfiguration.

The Virgin Birth.—Dr. M'Neile accepts the Virgin Birth of our Lord as a historical fact. He does so on two grounds—first, because no credible explanation of it, if fictitious, has been suggested; and next, because it is in agreement with the whole body of Christian belief.

If it is a fiction, the origin of the fiction is either Jewish or pagan, or it is a mixture of both. Those who say it is Jewish refer to the Immanuel prophecy of Isaiah as having suggested it. But if this prophecy had such an influence, how is it that, except in Mt 1²³, it is nowhere in the New Testament even remotely alluded to? Against the suggestion that the idea is of pagan origin are the facts that the narratives of the Virgin Birth are intensely Jewish, and that it would then be the work of Gentile Christians and of too late a date. The intermediate theory, that it is part Jewish and part pagan—that pagan mythology had moulded the ideas of certain Jewish circles—is Cheyne's suggestion. It has all the disadvantages of the other proposals and no advantages of its own.

Dr. M'Neile concludes: 'The belief, if not necessary to, is entirely congruous with, the apostle's attitude towards Christ as the "new Man," the "second Adam," i.e. the Founder and Source of a new and spiritual race. It is this congruity with the whole body of Christian belief, with the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Sacraments, which turns the scale for those who will not assert that miracles do not happen, much less that a miracle, avowedly unique, did not happen, but whom the literary evidence leaves in suspense.'

The Transfiguration.—It is still true that the Transfiguration is waiting its expositor. What was it meant to accomplish? And for whom? Dr. M'Neile sees one purpose in it. It was given to show that in Christ the Jewish religion had its fulfilment and was now to pass away.

It contains, he says, three main points. These are (1) the metamorphosis; (2) the converse with Moses and Elijah; and (3) the divine endorsement.

The metamorphosis or transfiguration recalls the shining of the face of Moses described in Exodus. This was a borrowed glory, and passed away. It signified the divine origin of the Law, which was now 'being done away.' But the Law and the Prophets, while passing away, are not lost; they find themselves realized in the new law of the Spirit of Christ. This is symbolized by the conversation which Moses and Elijah had with Christ—a conversation to be set beside that which each of them had already had with God (Ex 31¹⁸, 1 K 19⁹). Finally, the cloud descends; the Sonship of Christ is divinely attested; to hear Him is to hear the eternal truth of which the Law and the Prophets were but partial expressions. 'To attempt, therefore, to provide for the continuous presence of Moses and Elijah was a grave mistake; all that Christians need is to have that of "Jesus Himself."'

AFFIRMATIONS.

Dr. Havelock Ellis has issued a new edition of *Affirmations* (Constable; 6s. net). He has issued it without alteration of text, but he has written a new Preface. The book contains what some would call 'appreciations' of Nietzsche, Casanova, Zola, Huysmans, and 'St. Francis and others.' And these 'affirmations,' as Dr. Ellis calls them, stand after seventeen years. With the rest Nietzsche stands, even gaining something by the events of these late months.

Is not this shot through with new significance?

'Between 1873 and 1876 Nietzsche wrote four essays—on "David Strauss," "The Use and Abuse of History in relation to Life," "Schopenhauer as an Educator," and "Richard Wagner"—which were published as a series of *Unzeitgemässe Betrachtungen*. The essay on Strauss was written soon after the great war, amid the resulting outburst of flamboyant patriotism and the widely-expressed conviction that the war was a victory of "German culture." Fresh from the world of Greece, Nietzsche pours contempt on that assumption. Culture, he says, is, above all, unity of artistic style in every expression of a people's life. The exuberance of knowledge in which a German glories is neither a necessary means of culture nor a sign of it, being, indeed, more allied to the opposite of culture—to barbarism. It is in this barbarism that the modern German lives, that is to say, in a chaotic mixture of old styles. Look at his clothing,

Nietzsche continues, his houses, his streets, all his manners and customs. They are a turmoil of all styles in which he peacefully lives and moves. Such culture is really a phlegmatic absence of all sense of culture. Largely, also, it is merely a bad imitation of the real and productive culture of France, which it is supposed to have conquered in 1870. Let there be no chatter, he concludes, about the triumph of German culture, for at present no real German culture exists. The heroic figures of the German past were not "classics," as some imagine; they were seekers after a genuine German culture, and so regarded themselves. The would-be children of culture in Germany to-day are Philistines without knowing it, and the only unity they have achieved is a methodical barbarism.'

THE RELIGIOUS QUEST OF INDIA.

The Rev. J. N. Farquhar, M.A., and the Rev. H. D. Griswold, M.A., Ph.D., are the editors of a new series of volumes on the religion of India, to be published by Mr. Humphrey Milford at the Oxford University Press. Two volumes of the series have come out—*Indian Theism from the Vedic to the Muhammadan Period*, by Nicol Macnicol, M.A., D.Litt. (6s. net), and *The Heart of Jainism*, by Mrs. Sinclair Stevenson, M.A., Sc.D. (7s. 6d. net).

The series is to go by the general title of 'The Religious Quest of India.' What is the motive of it? There are two motives. We must give them in the editors' own words.

1. The editors endeavour to work in the sincere and sympathetic spirit of science. 'They desire to understand the perplexingly involved developments of thought and life in India and dispassionately to estimate their value. They recognize the futility of any such attempt to understand and evaluate, unless it is grounded in a thorough historical study of the phenomena investigated. In recognizing this fact they do no more than share what is common ground among all modern students of religion of any repute. But they also believe that it is necessary to set the practical side of each system in living relation to the beliefs and the literature, and that, in this regard, the close and direct contact which they have each had with Indian religious life ought to prove a source of valuable light. For, until a clear understanding has been gained of the practical influence exerted

by the habits of worship, by the practice of the ascetic, devotional or occult discipline, by the social organization and by the family system, the real impact of the faith upon the life of the individual and the community cannot be estimated; and, without the advantage of extended personal intercourse, a trustworthy account of the religious experience of a community can scarcely be achieved by even the most careful student.

2. 'They seek to set each form of Indian religion by the side of Christianity in such a way that the relationship may stand out clear. Jesus Christ has become to them the light of all their seeing, and they believe Him destined to be the light of the world. They are persuaded that sooner or later the age-long quest of the Indian spirit for religious truth and power will find in Him at once its goal and a new starting-point, and they will be content if the preparation of this series contributes in the smallest degree to hasten this consummation. If there be readers to whom this motive is unwelcome, they may be reminded that no man approaches the study of a religion without religious convictions, either positive or negative: for both reader and writer, therefore, it is better that these should be explicitly stated at the outset. Moreover, even a complete lack of sympathy with the motive here acknowledged need not diminish a reader's interest in following an honest and careful attempt to bring the religions of India into comparison with the religion which to-day is their only possible rival, and to which they largely owe their present noticeable and significant revival.'

Well, we have read these two volumes with some care—not out of mere good pleasure, nor because they are before us for review, but because we have been working on the religion of India for some time and wished to know what light these two authors, whom we already knew to be competent, could throw on the many perplexing problems which that study scatters on every learner's path. And we are prepared to say that they are written up to the editors' ideas with astonishing success, yet never fail to charm and enlighten the man who merely wants to know. Dr. Macnicol has had the easier task, or at least he has made it seem to be the easier. Mrs. Stevenson has pushed her way through much unfamiliar jungle and come out again into the light of day. Not every reader of books will struggle through with her; or think it worth while. And yet how truly Indian the book

is; how marvellous the revelation it gives us of the overcoming there must be before the philosophical mind of India can be won for Christ.

Dr. Macnicol is very agreeable reading. What it has cost him to be so easy we shall never know. We should know only if we tried to write a book like this ourselves.

One of the best short commentaries ever issued was that of Dr. Sutherland Black on Judges in the 'Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools.' Only a little larger is *The Book of Judges*, according to the Revised Version, by H. C. O. Lanchester, M.A., also issued by the Cambridge Press (1s. 6d. net). But Mr. Lanchester suffers nothing by the comparison. He has twenty-three years' research to build with. And he has his own most accurate and disciplined scholarship.

Mr. E. W. Lummis, M.A., of King's College, Cambridge, has made a contribution to the Synoptic Problem which is just as startling as the latest German pamphlet used to be, and much more stable. He believes, as almost everybody now believes, that, for the matter which they have in common with Mark, Matthew and Luke were dependent on that Gospel. But the matter which they have in common with one another and which is not taken from Mark he does not believe that they both took from some third source; he believes that Luke took it from Matthew. And to prove it he has published his book *How Luke was Written* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 4s. 6d. net).

Dr. Rendel Harris has written a recommendation of *Paradigms and Exercises in Syriac Grammar* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; 5s. net), and after his words no one will hesitate to buy the book. The author is Theodore H. Robinson, M.A., B.D., Professor of Hebrew and Syriac in Serampore College.

Two books have been added to Messrs. T. & T. Clark's 'Primers for Teachers and Senior Bible Class Students.' One is an introduction to the understanding of *The First Three Gospels*, by the Rev. W. Manson, B.A.; the other is an introduction to the practice of *The Christian Life*, by the Rev. R. H. Coats, M.A., B.D. (6d. net each). They agree together. First from Mr. Manson's

wonder of compression, clear and attractive, we learn what the Gospels tell us about themselves as the source of our knowledge of Christ and about Christ as the source of our life. Then by Mr. Coats we are taught what our life as the followers of Christ is and how we may live it. The books seem to us as well fitted for the uneducated as for the educated, for manhood as for youth.

There is a long lucid chapter on Mysticism in *The Magic of Experience*, by H. Stanley Redgrove (Dent; 2s. 6d. net), which is as likely to carry a mere beginner into that elusive subject as any chapter or book that has been written. For it is written with sufficient knowledge and with the most complete command of language. But that is not all the volume. The volume is an exposition of a system of philosophy which the author calls 'Idealistic or Rational Empiricism.' He thus explains: 'I use the term "empiricism," because I believe that no true knowledge is attainable apart from experience. I use the term "rational," because I believe that bare experience is not sufficient for this end: experience must be interpreted by reason. Experience, I believe, is the obverse of a coin of which the reverse is revelation: inductive reasoning is, in a sense, a magic ritual whereby fuller or higher revelation becomes possible: but the data of experience are the symbolic elements of this ritual, without which it cannot be performed or its products obtained. Finally, I use the term "idealistic," because I believe that all knowledge is knowledge of ideas, of the relations between ideas, and of minds wherein ideas exist.'

The early Quaker men must have been very good if they were better than the early Quaker women. Mabel Richmond Brailsford gives an account of the character and sufferings and work of *Quaker Women* from 1650 to 1690 (Duckworth; 7s. 6d. net). The greatest of them all was Margaret Fell, who became the wife of George Fox. Her story is well told, and it was surely well worth telling again. But the least of them all is great, persecution having given them the opportunity which they promptly seized. We do not fear in any single instance to anticipate the judgment of the future: 'These are they who have come out of the great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.'

The Rev. Thomas Kirk, Senior Minister of Haymarket United Free Church, Edinburgh, has already written monographs on Samson, Saul, Joseph, Jonah, and Daniel; and now he has written a monograph on Solomon. The title is *Solomon: His Life and Works* (Andrew Elliot; 3s. net). To profit by Mr. Kirk one must forget all that has been done on the criticism of the Bible and take it traditionally. Then the story that is told will be read with enjoyment, for the author has an attractive style of writing.

Not only the members of the Society of Friends, but also all those whose minds turn hopefully towards the ideal of Christian life for which the Friends stand, are well acquainted with the Swarthmore Lectures. Since 1907, they have been delivered and published every year, and by their breadth of sympathy, together with their spirituality, they have attracted many to admiration and imitation who will never be called Quakers. The Swarthmore Lecture for 1915 is in keeping. Its author is Silvanus P. Thompson, F.R.S.; its subject *The Quest for Truth* (Headley Brothers; 1s. net).

A series of volumes, entitled 'Modern Handbooks of Religion,' are under issue from the Lindsey Press (2s. net each). They are described as 'Books illustrative of the Principles and Faith of those who find the seat of Authority in Religion not in Church or Creed, but in the Mind and Conscience and Experience of Mankind.'

That description suggests the probability that the enemy is Trinitarianism. But it is not so. The four volumes of the series already issued all look the other way. The enemy is Rationalism. It follows that in the struggle with Rationalism these books are to be welcomed. It is true that Rationalism is not now the force that even a few years ago it threatened to be. It has become practically identified with materialism, and as an explanation of the universe, materialism has been steadily losing ground. But if they are fighting a losing battle, the rationalists are still fighting. And some of them in this country have a gift of plausible speaking which must be watched with vigilance. Their scholarship is not formidable, but they are not easily beaten in public persuasiveness. These books, therefore, written by Unitarians who are really scholars, are to be heartily welcomed.

For they are addressed to the very multitude with whom the rationalist finds acceptance. And they are written, every one of them, with an excellent understanding of the popular mind. More than that, they anticipate, they do not wait for the approach of the materialist. They seek to furnish men's minds with a right conception of Religion, that they may be fortified against the attack of Rationalism, however well armed with clever arguments and other weapons of moral frightfulness.

The volumes published are: (1) *Religion as affected by Modern Science and Philosophy*, by Stanley A. Mellor, B.A., Ph.D.; (2) *Religion in Social and National Life*, by H. D. Roberts; (3) *The New Testament in the Light of Modern Knowledge*, by Herbert McLachlan, M.A., B.D.; and (4) *Communion of Man with God*, by R. Nicol Cross, M.A.

Each volume contains a bibliography of its subject. But the worth of the books must not be estimated by the bibliographies. For in no case is the list of literature so good as it might have been.

The publishers have done their part well. The books are very cheap and very attractive.

The Rev. J. O. F. Murray, D.D., Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge, has published three sermons. The first sermon is on Faith, the second on Hope, the third on Love. Yet Dr. Murray calls the volume containing them *The Courage of Hope* (Lay Reader Headquarters; 1s. net). Has he decided to challenge the apostle's judgment that the greatest of these is Love? Perhaps not. But he has decided to challenge the judgment of the ordinary Christian in our own day that Hope is a feeble third to Faith and Love.

In writing the book entitled *My Priesthood* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), the Rev. Walter J. Carey, M.A., sets out deliberately to prove that the priest is a person apart from the people. But he does this, not to conclude that therefore the priest is to be courted and considered and think himself a superior person, but to insist upon his regarding himself as called to be humble and self-sacrificing and the servant of all. We think the separation which Mr. Carey seeks is excessive and unscriptural, but we approve of the devotion which he demands. There is one chapter in the book which every minister of Christ might read with profit. It is the chapter entitled 'The Priest as

Missioner.' On the matter of 'missions' Mr. Carey is a generation in front.

The Right Rev. Charles H. Brent, Bishop of the Philippine Islands, is a preacher. Every sermon in the volume *Prisoners of Hope* (Longmans; 5s. net) has cost him time and toil and trouble. And trouble, we say; for there is in every sermon a thought that has come out of the great tribulation. Take the sermon on Fairness. It demands a man who has won to preach an acceptable sermon on that. How dare he, unless he has risen out of the bigotry and bias so overwhelmingly associated with religion? And how could he speak of the Incarnation as due in fairness from God, unless he has shared the fellowship of the sufferings of the Incarnated? What an optimist he is—as all are who have come through. They know whom they have believed and are persuaded.

The last sermon in the book is on Flag Day. It ends with this:

'Nobly, nobly Cape S. Vincent to the north-west died away;
Sunset ran, one glorious blood-red, reeking into Cadiz Bay;
Bluish 'mid the burning water, full in face Trafalgar lay;
In the dimmest northeast distance dawned Gibraltar grand and gray;
Here and here did England help me; how can I help England, say!
Whoso turns as I this evening, turns to God to praise and pray,
While Jove's planet rises yonder silent over Africa.'

Messrs. Macmillan are the publishers of a new series of books which we wish we could place in every school and home library. It is true they are wholly devoted to the body, and on every page touch matters material rather than spiritual. But we have come at last to understand that the body also is a constant thought to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The series goes by the general title of 'The Health Series of Physiology and Hygiene.' The volume which has been sent us has the title of *Making the Most of Life* (3s. 6d.). It is the work of two authors, M. V. O'Shea, Professor of Education, in the

University of Wisconsin, and J. H. Kellogg, Superintendent of the Battle Creek Sanitarium. Every paragraph seems to have been well weighed, is clear to the understanding of the youngest, and touches the stern facts of daily living.

To 'Every Christian's Library' of very evangelical volumes Messrs. Pickering & Inglis have added *The Life that Pleases God*, a practical treatise on the preservation of the Spirit and Soul and Body, by A. T. Schofield, M.D., M.R.C.S. (1s. net).

Every sermon in the Rev. A. W. Gough's *God's Strong People* (Scott; 2s. 6d. net) is swept into the swirl of the war. Nevertheless they are not war sermons. They speak about the war; they are thrilled by the war; yet they are sermons on their texts, and out of their texts bring moral and religious truths, good for all times and peoples. Clearly Mr. Gough is a wise steward.

A small volume of simple evangelical sermons has been published by the Rev. J. Lionel Homer, Incumbent of Cargill, Canada, under the title of *Spiritual Fundamentals*. (Stock; 3s. net).

Through the same publishers, but from the other end of the earth, there comes a volume of sermons, dealing also with fundamental and spiritual things, and with similar evangelical simplicity. The title is *Seeing the Invisible*, and the author is the late Rev. N. A. Ross, M.A., LL.D., of Johannesburg (2s. 6d. net).

Professor H. A. Giles, LL.D., the author of the Hibbert Lectures for 1914 on *Confucianism and its Rivals* (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net), is a specialist. The moment he oversteps his boundaries he flounders hopelessly. His remarks about the Bible are full of humour, which is as harmless as it is unconscious. The lectures are popular, and for that reason they are not likely to obtain a large circulation, for the study of the religions of the world is not a popular study yet, though it is moving in that direction. First the scholars, and then the people.

In discussing the difficulties which Christianity has to meet in China, Dr. Giles lays stress on these three: 'First of all, the Confucian dogma that man is born good; secondly, the practice of ancestral worship, which, as has already been shown, is incompatible with Christian doctrine; and thirdly, the rules and practice of filial piety, due directly to the patriarchal system which still obtains in China. It has indeed been seriously urged that the unparalleled continuity of the Chinese nation is a reward for their faithful observance of the fifth commandment. In the face of this deeply implanted sentiment of reverence for parents, it is easy to see what a shock it must give to be told, as in Mk 10^{7, 29, 30}, that a man shall leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife; also, that if a man leaves his father and mother for Christ's sake and the gospel's, he will receive an hundredfold now in this time, and in the world to come eternal life.'

The Study of Theology.

BY THE REV. J. AGAR BEET, D.D., RICHMOND.

IN the June number of this magazine, Mr. Alban G. Widgery brings a serious indictment against theology, or at least against theologians, and contrasts theology unfavourably with other branches of knowledge. That this indictment contains much truth, I do not deny: but it is not a fair statement of the whole case; and the writer does not suggest a practical remedy. The seriousness of the matter prompts me to discuss it in this paper, and to propose a remedy.

The indictment is as follows: 'Theology alone still suffers from absolute uncertainty and poverty

of method. For in the Christian world Theology has been and is almost entirely dogmatic, starting with certain quite arbitrary assumptions and arguing to certain foregone conclusions. The chief assumptions are the truth of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and, among Catholics, the validity of the claim of the Church to interpret them. The foregone conclusions may be summarized as the traditional creeds. At times philosophers have independently discussed theological problems, but no free scientific Theology has yet been established. In this region of research, the

greatest need of to-day is perfect liberty to seek and proclaim the truth, unconcerned by the acquiescence or denial of the dignitaries of any ecclesiastical organization whatever.'

Touching the manuals put into the hands of students in some minor schools of theology, the above charge is true. But it is utterly untrue of the works of the best modern theologians. Of these, I may mention, as the ablest book of the kind which I have ever seen, Neander's *Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, published at Berlin in 1832 and frequently republished and translated. Throughout this great work, all conclusions rest on decisive evidence adduced, and are deduced from it by rational inference which compels conviction. The chief evidence is found in the sacred records preserved in the New Testament; these being tested, touching their genuineness, correctness of text, truth, and worth, in the full light of the scholarship of the day in which the book was written. Moreover, the modern scholarship which, since that day, has given us a purer text of the New Testament has done little or nothing to modify or add to the theological results recorded in the work mentioned above.

The evils referred to by Mr. Widgey flow from the complicated relation between the results of modern research and the traditional teaching of the Churches. In all ages, the disciples of Christ have been grouped in communities smaller or larger, bound together by mutual help and a common faith, propagated by oral teaching, public and private reading of the Bible and other books, and various forms of worship. This traditional belief reproduces for the more part the actual teaching of Christ, and has commended itself as substantially true by its influence on the mind, heart, and life of multitudes of men and women in all ages and in all positions in life.

In different communities theological tradition took different, and sometimes contradictory, forms; and these differences gave rise to theological controversy. This contradiction reveals error on one or both sides. And, in many cases, the error escaped detection because of the helpful truth with which it was associated.

These varieties of belief took permanent form in carefully worded creeds, convenient records of the belief of those who made them. Of these I may mention, as the most valuable of them all, what is now commonly called the Nicene Creed, a wonder-

ful link binding together all the older and many modern Churches. Of modern creeds, I may add the Augsburg Confession, the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, the Anglican Articles, and the Westminster Confession. These various formularies reveal, amid minor differences, a wonderful agreement, each with the others, and all with the teaching of the New Testament. Some other forms, *e.g.* the Articles of the Synod of Dort and those of the Dutch Remonstrants, reveal more acute differences.

Each denomination must have, in order to secure continuance, schools of theology; and in these schools the teaching must be in harmony with the general belief of those who support them. Now in all schools of learning, theological, literary, and scientific, the beliefs of the teachers and the evidence they adduce mould more or less the beliefs of their pupils. For it is much easier and more convenient for these last to accept the conclusions thus set before them ready-made than to sift for themselves the evidence on which they rest. All this, and the material interests involved, tend to warp the judgment, and limit the freedom of thought, of students of theology; and prompts some men, especially in official positions, to conceal secret aberrations from the traditional beliefs. Such concealment is unworthy and degrading.

What, then, is to be done? An adequate remedy, the only remedy, is in the hands of every theological professor, pastor, and church member. Let each one sift carefully for himself the grounds on which rest the beliefs which are living factors in his own religious life as carefully as every man of business sifts the trustworthiness of those to whom he entrusts his goods. This is easier and much less dangerous than at first sight appears. For the points of agreement in all churches are much greater and more important than are the differences. But, whether easy or difficult, safe or dangerous, such sifting of the grounds of our faith is absolutely needful. For with truth error is apt to mingle: and all error obscures and weakens the truth.

What is needed is a profound sense of the importance and sacredness of THE TRUTH. Christ said, 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life.' The Truth is the Way of Life. All error leads away from Christ, and towards death. Consequently, our loyalty to Him binds us both to seek

the Truth, and to make known to others whatever truth we believe that we have found, seeking their judgment about it. In other words, we are bound to place, before all sincere inquirers, without reserve, the results of our own search for the Truth. In this search and announcement, many have laid down their lives. But the Truth still lives and reigns in Christ; and is able to repay, and will repay, every sacrifice made on its behalf.

This full and frank statement is specially needful in our day. For every one knows that we do not hold now all that our fathers held and asserted sixty years ago. And intelligent and devout men and women ask what these changes are, on what grounds they rest, and what our teachers are still prepared to assert and maintain. This last is of utmost importance. When the whole case is fully stated, it will appear that all we value most in the Christian tradition is confirmed by modern scholarship, and that the changes which this last has forced upon us strengthen immensely the foundation of the historical faith of the Church.

The chief changes are as follows:

1. Our fathers taught confidently that every statement in the Bible, especially touching morality and religion, is true in the sense intended by the writers. This theory of Inerrancy has been disproved by more careful search of the sacred documents. There are, especially in the Old Testament, moral sentiments expressed and approved which the cultivated moral sense of the disciples of Christ forbids them to accept; and some apparently contradictory statements of fact. Even touching the day on which Christ was put to death, the plain statements in Mt 26¹⁷, Mk 14¹², Lk 22⁷ are inconsistent with what nearly all scholars accept as more accurate indications of time in Jn 18²⁸ 19³¹.

These inaccuracies, here and there, in small details do not lessen the supreme and infinite value of the sacred records of the life and teaching of Christ. For, in the marvellous general agreement or harmony of the Four Gospels, the Book of Acts, a remarkable Apocalyptic work, and various letters, some of which are traced by decisive evidence, such as can be brought for no other ancient documents, to the founder of the Churches of Europe,—in these various witnesses compared we find abundant evidence, sufficient to banish all doubt, touching the historical reality and the teaching of Christ. In the Old Testament,

testing the authorship and date of its various books, and the correctness of our copies, as we should any other similar ancient works, we have evidence abundantly sufficient to prove that God revealed Himself to Israel with a clearness and fulness not given to any other ancient nation.

Thus, in the New and Old Testaments we have all the documentary evidence needful for intelligent and assured faith in Christ and in God. The now absolute theory of Inerrancy, for which no adequate evidence has ever been brought, somewhat obscured this abundant internal evidence of their substantial historical truth. In other words, modern scholarship has been a retreat from an untenable to an impregnable position.

2. Another marked difference between the almost unanimous belief of all thoughtful men to-day and the opinions current sixty years ago touches the human life of the Incarnate Son. It was then too hastily assumed that the Sacred Boy in the temple courts was in full exercise of divine omniscience and omnipotence. Vain attempts were made to harmonize these with the growth in knowledge recorded in Lk 2⁵², with His ignorance (Mt 24³⁶, Mk 13³²) of the day of His return, and (Mt 26⁵³) with the 'twelve legions of angels' ready to rescue Him from His enemies. For growth in knowledge is impossible to one who already knows all things, and the help of angels was superfluous to the Almighty. The true reconciliation is plainly stated in Ph 2⁷, where we read that 'He emptied himself,' and in 2 Co 8⁹, 'He became poor, though he was rich.' This self-limitation of the Incarnate Son does not lessen His authority as a Teacher sent by God. For the close harmony of various witnesses is complete proof of their historical correctness; and the appeal of this teaching to man's felt need of salvation, and its verification in the experience and life of untold multitudes, leave no room for doubt that this harmonious and life-giving teaching is a correct reproduction of the actual teaching of Christ and a true statement of the merciful purpose of God.

3. A still more conspicuous change is seen in the treatment, in the modern pulpit, of the Doom of the Lost. Our fathers did not hesitate to say that it would be endless suffering as bad as the agony caused by fire to living and conscious bodies. A keener sense of the mercy of God, and of the due proportion of crime and punishment, has long ago made such teaching impossible. But in this

as in the other cases, we must guard against the opposite extreme. This solemn topic, so conspicuous in the teaching of Christ and His Apostles, has almost vanished from the modern pulpit. This ought not so to be. The way of safety is to follow the writers of the New Testament, who describe it, more frequently than all other expressions put together, by the one Greek word rendered sometimes *destroy* and *destruction*, at other times *perish* and *perdition*, and elsewhere *lose* and *lost*. The word thus rendered means, not necessarily either extinction or endless suffering, but always the loss of whatever gives worth to existence. The solemn teaching in Ph 3¹⁹, touching 'the enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is *destruction*,' demands emphatic assertion to-day.

Some writers make the great mistake of putting more emphasis upon the small errors which modern scholarship has detected in the ancient traditions of the Church rather than on the all-important elements in which the ancient tradition has been confirmed by modern research. To some ears, discord is more conspicuous than harmony. But the trained ear listens for and delights in concord.

The close agreement between the indisputably genuine letters of Paul, the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John, the Synoptic Gospels, and the Book of Revelation, four very different types of teaching, all coming down to us from the first century, without any substantial note of discord, leave no room for doubt that the Founder of Christianity claimed for Himself a unique relation to God, raising Him above men and angels as the only begotten Son of God; and that this supreme claim was accepted by all His disciples whose opinions have come down to us, with complete confidence, because they had proof which convinced them that the body laid dead in the grave had returned to life and was raised to heaven. Similar harmonious agreement proves that, along with moral teaching loftier than even the highest in the Old Testament, He announced pardon of sins and endless life with God in heaven for all who put faith in Him and walk in His steps; and that He promised to them the Holy Spirit of God, to be in them the breath of a new life of devotion to God, and a divinely-given pledge of endless blessedness. All this rests, as I have proved in my *Manual of Theology*, on decisive historical and documentary evidence, confirmed by an experience

which has transformed and raised their whole inward and outward life.

Compared with this evidence, the changes noted above are insignificant.

A serious defect in Mr. Widgery's paper is the oversight of the chief evidence on which theology rests, namely, the religious literature of ancient and modern times, in which lie open to our inspection the thoughts, and in some measure the lives of men who, in all ages and in widely different circumstances, have pondered the great unseen realities which underlie human thought and life.

This literature falls into three clearly marked divisions. Every one who reads carefully (1) the New Testament and compares it with the Old, with other ancient literature, and with later Christian literature, finds in the contrasts thus presented decisive proof that Jesus of Nazareth gave to the world a religious impulse which turned back into a new and better channel the whole course of human life and thought. This claims for the New Testament a supreme place as the earliest record of the most wonderful teaching ever given to man. Similarly, comparison of (2) the Old Testament with (3) all contemporary literature proves that Israel anticipated the teaching of Jesus about God in a measure infinitely above that of any Gentile nation. On the other hand, a comparison of the Old and New Testaments reveals the immense addition which Jesus made to our knowledge of God. Our study of theology must include these three great divisions of religious literature.

This literature is embodied in ancient languages known to us only by philological methods. Yet Mr. Widgery says that 'Far too much time is spent in most of our theological colleges and divinity halls in philological studies, which have not even a secondary value for the ministerial office.' But whatever else they are taught, all theological students need, and may easily gain, a good working knowledge of that wonderful language in which the words of Christ, the narratives of the Evangelists, and the teaching of some of the Apostles, have come down to us. And this implies careful philological study of words, inflexions, and phrases.

Oversight of this primary element of theological research makes Mr. Widgery's paper little more than a caricature. Evidently he has seen theological teaching only in its most defective forms.

He says: 'Except among a few scholars attached to free religious bodies, such (absolute) freedom has never existed in the Christian Churches in the past, and it does not exist to-day. Almost all theological students—including most Professors of Divinity—are officially attached to ecclesiastical organizations, to hold any position in which subscription to specific statements of doctrine is demanded.' He adds: 'Faculties of Theology should be quite free, and in the interest of thought and religion itself no one should be allowed to occupy a Chair of Divinity who holds any position which requires definite adherence to prescribed doctrine.' But he has not faced the difficulties in the way of this negative suggestion. At the same time, the matter of subscription deserves consideration.

But, apart from this, a simpler path is open. Let each one claim and take liberty for himself. For this, all that is needed is the courage of our convictions, inspired by a due appreciation of the infinite value and sacredness of the Truth. This will stimulate earnest and patient search for it, and a frank and unreserved statement, to all sincere inquirers, of whatever we have found. We must also admit the limitations of our knowledge. This will evoke our pupils' confidence, and open a way for their intelligent reception of those

many matters for which we can bring decisive evidence.

The above criticisms pass in silence over many good things in Mr. Widgery's thoughtful paper. Even caricature is a legitimate form of literature. And it may do good by calling attention to what in the past has been, and to some extent still is, a serious hindrance to progress in theological thought. We have been more anxious to bring our pupils to our own opinions than to evoke in them intelligent convictions of their own. That so intelligent a man as Mr. Widgery has this opinion about theological method, reveals serious fault somewhere.

Another point to be ever kept in mind by teachers, especially by those who teach the future pastors of the flock of Christ, is that knowledge implies responsibility. Whatever we know about the eternal realities has been revealed to us by God in order that we may pass it on to others. That light shines upon us from and through the Cross of Christ. By teaching the Truth, and so far as our teaching corresponds with the Truth, we impart to others the infinite blessings purchased for us and for them by that great Sacrifice. Consequently our loyalty to Christ binds us to loyalty to the Truth, both in our search for it, and in its announcement to others.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Pre-Hellenic Civilization.¹

THE appearance of the new edition of M. Dussaud's big book, and the publication of Mr. Hall's new volume—a companion to Handcock's *Mesopotamian Archaeology*—are very appropriate at the present time, when, even apart from the outbreak of war, there is a kind of pause in the onward movement of investigation.

By and by, no doubt, when things have readjusted themselves in the various areas concerned, the movement will be resumed, perhaps with all the greater vigour for the pause, and probably under very different and more favourable condi-

tions, in some lands at least, than have hitherto characterized the progress of exploration. Meanwhile the pause is a very fitting opportunity for archæological stock-taking, and that is what the volumes of M. Dussaud and Mr. Hall really amount to.

Of the two books, that of M. Dussaud is, of course, incomparably the more exhaustive. It not only covers a good deal more ground than Mr. Hall's, taking in the Troad, which Mr. Hall expressly rules out, and devoting a long chapter (rather too long) to the civilization of Cyprus, which Mr. Hall only handles incidentally; but it also deals at considerable length with matters which the scheme of the English writer's book only permits him to glance at in passing. Thus the chapters on *Ægean* influence in Palestine and

¹ *Les Civilisations Préhelléniques dans le Bassin de la Mer Égée*. Par René Dussaud. Second edition, 1914. *Ægean Archaeology*. By H. R. Hall. 1914.

Syria, and on Cults and Myths, which form a considerable, and not the least interesting, portion of M. Dussaud's book, have no counterpart in that of Mr. Hall.

On the other hand, the English volume, strange to say, displays much better proportion, and a much more useful grouping of material. This is what one is accustomed rather to expect from a French author; but there is no denying the fact that M. Dussaud has been rather overburdened with his material. At this time of day it is scarcely possible to see so clearly the bearings of much that has been discovered in the Ægean as to enable the discoveries to be grouped, each in its proper place, and presented, each in its true proportion and relation. The consequence is that M. Dussaud, anxious to leave nothing out, has presented his readers with an enormous mass of details which sometimes, like the ancient art with which he deals, is lacking in perspective. Again and again, in his otherwise most interesting volume, it is the old story of not being able to see the wood for the trees. Mr. Hall has avoided this difficulty by a more rigid self-denial and restraint in the selection of his material; and he has his reward, for one is never at a loss to see the bearing of his material on his story.

Altogether, these two volumes have now done for the present day what the *Mycenæan Age* of Tsountas and Manatt, and Mr. Hall's earlier volume *The Oldest Civilization of Greece* did for the days before the Cretan explorations of Sir Arthur Evans and the Italian mission under Dr. Halbherr.

It is, of course, quite needless to attempt any description of the civilization whose relics, so sadly mutilated, and yet so infinitely suggestive, are here detailed and pictured. The general outlines of the facts which came to light as Schliemann, and after him Dörpfeld and Tsountas unveiled the civilization known to the end of last century as Mycenæan, and Evans, Halbherr, and Seager followed with the revelation of the earlier and nobler Minoan culture of Crete—these outlines are far too familiar to require any redrawing. Everybody knows now that instead of ancient civilization, in the world that counts in classical antiquity, being limited to the two great rival cultures of the Nile and Euphrates valleys, we have to make room in our scheme of history for a third culture, probably quite as ancient as that of

either Egypt or Babylonia, quite as remarkable, at least in many of its developments, as either of its contemporaries, and with elements in it which make it even more interesting to us, from some points of view, than the cultures of the two great river valleys can ever be. For the Island Civilization which had grown old and passed away long before the Homeric Period was the mother of all that wonder of art and literature which we know as Greek culture; and while the Hellenes, no doubt, owed a vast deal to the sterner strain of Achæan and Dorian blood whose union with the conquered Minoans bore the fruit of Hellenism, they owed not less to the softer, swifter, subtler, and more beauty-loving genius of the older race.

Some day, perhaps, exploration will give us the materials, and fortune give us the genius capable of grouping them all in their true relations and weaving them into a connected story. And then we shall have the most wonderful romance in the whole history of the human race, telling us how it came to pass that by the union of the brilliant and unrestrained genius of the Minoan with the sterner and more austere force of the conquering races there came into the world the Greek as we see him in history, literature, and art. Meanwhile, we can only wonder at the mysterious alchemy by which the daring and adventurous art of Crete, sometimes overflowing, in the fulness of its life, into what we can only call bad taste and gaudiness, was curbed and refined until its motto became 'nothing in excess' and its representatives were Pheidias and Praxiteles, Lysippus and Ictinus.

In the presence of the great art of Mesopotamia, and even more of Egypt, one feels that here is something which, however splendid, will reach, or perhaps even has reached, a conclusion, and has nothing more to say; but the art of the Minoan, with all its crudities and imperfections, is seminal, with all the promise of the future in it—a future whose splendour we now can realize. The frescoes of Knossos are the work of artistic genius absolutely untrammelled, and only feeling its way, through excesses and in spite of occasional lapses of taste, to something great; the Parthenon Friezes or the Apoxyomenos represent the attainment towards which the unknown Minoan was striving. Curiously enough, as one looks at the reproductions in either of these volumes—the Hunting-Cat Fresco—the famous Cup-Bearer—the Silver Vase fragment from Mycenæ, and contrasts them with

fifth-century Greek work, the art that is really a millennium older appears infinitely more modern, in spite of its faults of execution—perhaps because we moderns too, like the Minoan, are struggling in our day towards something that we do not as yet fully understand, and cannot adequately express.

It is the same with Ægean architecture. Here, of course, we are hampered by the fact that, save at Knossos and, in a less degree, at Phaistos, we have scarcely more than outlines and basements to guide us. Yet it seems fairly evident that the Minoan architect, like the Minoan artist, had a superabundance of vigour and idea, but had still to learn how to group and proportion his conceptions. Probably the palace of Knossos, with all its splendour, would strike us, could we have seen it in its glory, as, in one sense, barbaric; it has been variously described as something on the lines of a Thibetan Lamassery or a Greek monastery. The life and the power were there; but the absorbingly interesting question is: How were they chastened and subdued, till the Parthenon or the Theseium took the place of Knossos and Phaistos?

How wonderful this Ægean civilization was, is seen, of course, mainly in the Cretan discoveries at Knossos, Phaistos, and Hagia Triada, where the Minoan palaces have yielded up the wrecks of their ancient treasures, and at Gournia, Palaikastro, Zakro, Mokhlos, and Pseira, where the relics of the middle-class, the business and seafaring section of the Minoan community have come to light. M. Dussaud's chapters on the Cyclades, the Troad, Cyprus, and continental Greece only serve to deepen the impression of the overpowering originality and dominance of Crete. They preserve the balance, in a sense, by reminding us of what we are apt to forget under the spell of the Cretan discoveries, that other Ægean lands shared largely in the same civilization; but, all the same, there is no mistaking the supremacy of Crete. The Cyclades yield much; but the best of their art is obviously inspired from Crete in those cases where it is not of direct importation. (Mr. Hall holds the famous flying-fish fresco of Phylakopi in Melos to be a Cretan work of art imported by a Melian grandee.) Even in continental Greece, the best of the treasures, such as the Vaphio cups, are of Cretan origin. And as for Cyprus, to whose awkward and clumsy perversions of Cretan ideas M. Dussaud devotes a long chapter much of whose

space might have been better employed, she apparently would scarcely have had anything worth calling civilization or art, had it not been for comparatively late borrowings from her sister island—which she did her best to spoil when she got them.

The impression gathered from the whole mass of work left behind by the Ægean race, whether it worked in the flush of its youth and vigour in Crete, in the golden days before the overthrow of the great sea-empire of Knossos, or with lessening vigour and decaying taste in the other islands and on the mainland sites after the great catastrophe, is that of a people of astonishing mental agility, alert and sensitive in a high degree to original ideas, extraordinarily modern in many of their views—as to cleanliness and sanitation, for example, to say nothing of the dress of their womenkind. In some respects it almost seems as though the Minoan of the 15th century B.C. were nearer to us in his habit of life than our own ancestors of the 18th century A.D. Certainly, if Knossos be the test, he was a cleaner creature than they. Instinctively one feels the suggestion of France and French feeling and genius in much of the work of the Minoans. There is a daintiness, a quick fancy, and a lightness of touch about the Ægean artist, which are thoroughly French, so that one feels it only natural that the Minoan ladies should have worn the low-necked gowns with wasp waists and many flounces which suggest the court of the Second Empire rather than anything Greek or Oriental.

No doubt behind all the brightness and the love of beauty, so manifest upon the surface, there was a darker side to the Minoan character. The old classical legends attest the existence of this more sinister aspect of this ancient civilization. The Minotaur, whatever be the real origin of the legend, belonged to a race which had left a mark of cruelty and terror upon the imagination of the ancient Ægean world; while the Bull-grappling frescoes suggest a good deal of callousness in respect of human suffering, whether we are to regard this *ταυροκαθάψια* as a religious rite or not. There are seal-impressions from Zakro and elsewhere which reveal a strange, weird, unpleasant twist in the Minoan nature. The Egyptian combinations of animal head and human body in the images of some of their gods are bad enough; but they are restrained and dignified compared with some of the figures of nightmare that are seen on M.

Dussaud's pages. There was something perverted and unhealthy in the fancy that designed such monsters, whether their significance was sacred or merely fantastic. Yet, all the same, to turn from the reliefs of an Assyrian palace to the frescoes of Knossos is like turning from a shambles to a green meadow in spring-time. The Assyrian was a magnificent and cultured brute, the Minoan was a true artist.

On the question of the language of this remarkable race, M. Dussaud does not give us much enlightenment. Nor, unfortunately, does it seem as though much will ever be done in this direction, abundant though the materials are, until the discovery of a bilingual text. Such a thing ought to be quite within the bounds of possibility. The relations between Crete and Egypt were close and intimate for many centuries, and it would seem by no means unlikely that bilingual copies of treaties, commercial or otherwise, between the two empires, should have been in existence. Meanwhile the Minoan tablets remain alongside the Hittite inscriptions—a standing provocation. The attempts that have been made to read either them or the curious inscriptions, evidently from a foreign source, on the Phaistos disk, do not inspire confidence.

The chapters of M. Dussaud's book to which the average reader will turn with greatest expectation are those on Ægean influence in Egypt and Syria, and on Cults and Myths. Unfortunately the result is rather disappointing than otherwise. Particularly is this the case with regard to the Egyptian section of the former chapter. M. Dussaud begins his discussion of Ægean influence by saying that the Cretan genius has been fertilized by Egyptian Art, and, further, that there is evidence in the record of the development of the Ægean marine, that the relations between the two civilizations were reciprocal. In this there can be no doubt that he is absolutely right; and such statements made with such emphasis, lead one to expect a correspondingly full treatment of these relations, in regard to which we have fuller evidence than exists for any other races or lands with which the Ægean civilization had touch. Instead, we get a miserable eight pages, or rather less, of which a considerable portion is occupied with illustrations, none too happily chosen, and in which there occur such statements as that the Ægean races are mentioned in the Egyptian texts

from the time of the first dynasty under the name of *Hanebu*. No evidence is produced for this statement, which is open to very grave question. On the other hand, M. Dussaud appears to attach singularly little importance to the actual discoveries of early dynastic Egyptian stoneware in Crete, and of black incised pottery of apparently Ægean origin in Egypt—a far more significant matter than questionable references.

Nor are the later relations handled in a much more satisfactory manner. In dealing with the period of the Empire, the author naturally discusses the famous representations of Keftiu in the tombs of Sen-mut, Rekhmara, and Men-khepera-senb, and accepts the general identification of these foreign tribute bearers with the men of Minoan Crete, regarding Keftiu, Kaphtor, and Crete as one and the same. So far good; but M. Dussaud is not entitled to evade the difficulties of this probably perfectly accurate theory as he does. When the figures, not only of Cretan Keftiu, but of Syrian Retennu, are represented bearing manifestly Ægean vessels, it is not sufficient to explain this fact by the suggestion that the Egyptian artist often put more haste than conscience into his work. Surely in this case it is the modern writer rather than the ancient artist who is hasty. If he had been speaking of illuminations for a commercial copy of the Book of the Dead the remark might have passed; but it is rash to assume that the Theban tomb-paintings, the most priceless contemporary documents for the appearance and garb of these ancient races, are carelessly handled. So far as can be judged by comparisons of Cretan frescoes, the Egyptian artist was as careful as could reasonably be expected. Moreover, M. Dussaud's hasty remark has a double edge. If the tomb-paintings are not good evidence in the case of the Retennu, can we assume that they are good evidence in that of the Keftiu? If the facts will not square in every detail with the theory, surely it is safer to admit the slight discrepancy, and to inquire whether some modification of the theory may not be required, and whether the apparent inconsistency may not lead to a fuller knowledge of the wider extension of Ægean influence.

In the discussion of Syrian relations, the most interesting point is, of course, the question of the Philistines. There are few things more remarkable than the way in which Archæology has come to the rescue of the reputation of Israel's ancient

enemies, and, by associating them with the remnants of the wrecked Minoan culture, has shown us that they were far from being the uncultured barbarians of current imagination, but, on the contrary, were a race more highly civilized and more advanced than the Israelites against whom they fought. The identification seems now to have practically passed into the realm of accepted fact, though there are still some who question it, and though the argument from the resemblance of the feather head-dress of the Pulusati in the Medinet Habu reliefs of Ramses III. to that of the heads on the Phaistos disk is scarcely one to be pressed, even in the guarded form in which M. Dussaud presents it, in view of the probability that the Phaistos disk is not a native Cretan piece of work. Assuming that the identification of the Zakkaru with the Cretans of Zakro is to hold, we must conclude that from shortly after 1200 B.C. the entire coastland of Palestine from Dor southwards was in the hands of a race of Cretan-origin, the inheritor of the great Minoan tradition, which had been driven originally from its home by the great catastrophe of Knossos in 1400 B.C., and after long wanderings had at last found a resting-place.

Mr. Macalister has aptly pointed out the curious inversion, in the encounter of Israelite and Philistine, of what we are accustomed to consider the normal relation between East and West; the Western race, in this instance, being the one with the great historic past and the old tradition, while the Eastern was, comparatively speaking, of yesterday.

M. Dussaud recognizes the repute of the Philistines as redoubtable soldiers, a repute probably due, in the main, to their possession of superior arms, the passage 1 S 13^{19th} seeming to indicate that they jealously guarded for themselves the newly realized advantages of iron weapons. Apart from this advantage, it is difficult to see wherein their superiority can have consisted. Certainly not in physique, where the advantage probably lay on the other side. M. Dussaud cites Goliath; but there is no evidence that Goliath was of the same origin as the men on whose side he fought. Rather the special way in which he and his gigantic brethren are mentioned points to their having been the descendants of an older race of larger frame which had been absorbed by the Cretan conquerors. All the evidence points in the direc-

tion of the Ægean race having been one of comparatively small men, relying more upon quickness and alertness of brain than upon brute force.

Though, as M. Dussaud observes, the Philistines seem to have almost entirely abandoned their old island gods in favour of the gods of their new home, Dagon, Ashtoreth, and Baalzebub, yet traces of the ancient Cretan influence survive. The votive offerings of the golden tumours and golden mice which accompanied the ark on its return from Philistia come from the same stock as the votive figures and limbs of Petsofa and the offerings of the Dictæan Cave.

There remains the still very obscure question of the Ægean Religion. M. Dussaud's chapter on this subject is probably the most valuable part of his volume, not for any constructive effort at an outline of the religion, but for the fact that it gathers together practically every detail that has been discovered with regard to Ægean belief and worship. In the five sections of a very long chapter the author deals with Places of Worship, Cult Objects, Idols and Ritual Gestures, Myths and Legends, and Worship of the Gods and of the Dead; and the diligence with which he has assembled his material is worthy of all praise. At the same time, this is still only a stone-heap for the future builder. The chapter is a great collection of facts about certain gods and certain acts of worship; but no attempt has been made to create a picture of a religion. That, of course, is no fault of the author, for as yet no picture seems to be possible.

We vaguely discern a faith in which the supreme deity was not a god, but a goddess, a Great Mother, source of all life, human and animal alike, and into which a secondary male deity was introduced, at a later date, and perhaps by a conquering race, and was united in a sacred marriage to the original mother goddess. To the goddess various creatures are specially sacred—the dove, often perched upon her head; the lion, posed on either side of her as a guardian,—supremely the serpent, to which, as a Chthonic deity, she has close affinity, and which is represented, as at Gournia and in the faience figures of Knossos, twisted round her arms. The sacred animal of the minor male deity is apparently the bull, and his emblem is the Double Axe.

Worship is conducted originally in sacred caverns, such as the grotto of Psychro—the Dictæan Cave

—sacrifice and libation being part of the ritual. Later, the cave sanctuary becomes transformed into the household sanctuary which is characteristic of Cretan religion. There are no temples in existence, but only small shrines. Several of these have been found in the Cretan palaces; while it has been suggested that the whole structure of such buildings as the palaces of Knossos and Phaistos partook of a sacred character, and that the great width of the superb staircases was due to the fact that they were used for processional services. Dr. Mackenzie has stated that the tendency at Knossos was for each house to have its own shrine, and M. Dussaud concurs: 'It is probable that each dwelling possessed a place consecrated to private worship.' This is one of the distinguishing features characteristic of what Professor Petrie very truly calls 'the refreshing originality of Crete.' Minoan worship was family worship. Another feature is the prominence of women in acts of worship. It cannot be said with certainty that the Minoan worship was conducted by priestesses instead of priests; but certainly women are far more prominent than men in the various representations of ritual—particularly, *e.g.*, on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus to which M. Dussaud devotes considerable space.

In dealing with Cult Objects, the author shows, as he has done more or less throughout the volume, a decided prejudice against the idea of Pillar-worship among the Minoans. The vigour with which he presses his denial of the baetylic character of the various Minoan pillars hitherto assumed to have a sacred significance is almost in inverse proportion to the amount of evidence which he brings against the views of Sir Arthur Evans (*Mycenæan Tree and Pillar Cult*); and in some cases, as in dealing with the pillars which have the goddess's special emblem of the dove perched upon them, his argument amounts only to looking the difficulty boldly in the face and passing by on the other side. Again, the eagerness to discard the pillar as a sacred emblem goes, curiously enough, along with a desire to assume the sacredness of the

spiral, which seems to have less evidence in its favour. 'One feels,' says M. Dussaud, 'that it is not only its decorative value that has ensured its extreme diffusion: it had a particular value in the worship.' But why? One would naturally imagine that the decorative value of the spiral would ensure its wide diffusion from the moment that it was first realized by so artistic a race, quite apart from any question of religious significance. This, however, is a trifling blemish upon a chapter which is by far the fullest extant collection of material for the study of Ægean religion, and which is marked besides by a very refreshing sanity and common sense in its dealing with some of the problems raised.

Unfortunately in both volumes the date of publication has hindered the inclusion of any reproduction or notice of what is probably (if its genuineness be finally attested) the most remarkable work of Minoan art so far known to exist. This is the ivory and gold image of the Snake Goddess which has recently come into the possession of the Boston Museum, U.S.A.; and which has been reproduced in the *Bulletin* of the Museum, and in Professor Petrie's quarterly, *Ancient Egypt* (Part ii., 1915). As an idol, this extraordinary little figure merely repeats the ideas of the familiar snake goddesses of Knossos; but as a work of art it is altogether unique. Mr. Hall speaks of students of Greek religion gasping at the faience figures of the snake goddesses. But should the Boston statuette be finally accepted as a genuine piece of Minoan work, students of Greek art will be left still more breathless when they see details of the representation of the human face which were believed not to have been realized till the 4th century B.C., anticipated by the Minoan artist at least a thousand years before. I say nothing of the divine lady's Parisian gown, which is neither more nor less than an intelligent anticipation of the fashions of the present spring, only much more gracefully carried out.

JAMES BAIKIE.

Edinburgh.

Contributions and Comments.

St. Paul's Imprisonment at Rome and the Text of the Acts.

AN authority on New Testament Textual Criticism¹ has justly remarked that even the most modest effort to elucidate the formation of the Western text of the Lukan writings is helpful as a clue to the key of the whole history of the New Testament. It would, doubtless, be idle to expect a perfect solution capable of explaining all the peculiarities of the text, just as it would be highly presumptuous to imagine that one is free to evolve a general theory out of the probability furnished by a variant or set of variants. It is beyond question that while the readings of the Western text afford indications of deliberate revision, they never show signs of any plan of coherent and continuous execution. They are rather the work of many hands employed in various places and at different times. Hence a prudent criticism of the text should rest content with the possible genesis of individual variants, leaving to a riper age of Textual Criticism the task of accounting for the text as a whole.

A variant little if at all taken into account in striking the balance between the two texts of the Acts, is that found in ch. 28¹⁶. Yet examined in the light furnished by archæological data it would seem to be of great value—so great, in fact, as to afford fresh evidence of the deformed and derived nature of the Western text (numbered δ by Kenyon) as compared with the Eastern text (β).

In its twofold forms this verse presents important points of divergence which may be outlined as follows :—

β (recension represented by codices $\aleph$ ABC; versions and Alexandrine Fathers): ὅτε δὲ εἰσῆλθομεν εἰς Ῥώμην, ἐπετράπη τῷ Παύλῳ μένειν καθ' ἑαυτὸν σὺν τῷ φυλάσσοντι αὐτὸν στρατιώτῃ.

δ (recension represented by codex D, according to the substantially exact reconstruction of the missing part of it, taken from Ac 22²⁹, to end; some codices of the *Itala*, the *Versio Syriaca posterior sive Philoxeniana correctæ*, Cyprian, the *Speculum*; and, in mixed form, by the *Gigas Latinus Stockholmiensis* of the thirteenth century):

ὅτε δὲ ἤλθομεν εἰς Ῥώμην, ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος παρέδωκε τοὺς δεσμίους τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῃ[·χω], τῷ Παύλῳ ἐπετράπη μένειν καθ' ἑαυτὸν (ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς) σὺν τῷ φυλάσσοντι αὐτὸν στρατιώτῃ.—Cum venissemus autem Romam, centurio tradidit custodius *principi peregrinorum*; permissum autem Paulo forus manere extra castra, custodientibus eum militibus.

To form a correct estimate of the respective values of these two recensions and of the possible relations existing between them, it is advisable to take as a starting-point certain conclusions, now admitted to be sound, on the subject of the origin and function of the *Peregrini*.

Existing inscriptions show that, dating from the times of Hadrian, the office of purveyors to the imperial household, previously entrusted to freedmen, came to an end and passed into the hands of a special body known as the *Frumentarii*, taken promiscuously from the various legions, with Rome as centre, and intended to do for the imperial household all the commissariat work previously done by the other *Frumentarii* in the service of the armies scattered over the different military stations. To this body Septimius Severus gave a stricter organization, with quarters (*castra*) on the Celian Hill. Ere long the functions of purveying become transformed into those of a police force, with the added *metier* of spying. And under these circumstances it is easy to imagine that the body of *Frumentarii* were not looked upon with much sympathy by the bantering population of Rome, who treated them as outsiders and gave them the name of *Peregrini*.²

Examined in the light of these data, the text of Ac 28¹⁶ absolutely cannot be taken as an example of the origin of the *Frumentarii*, as has been done by Mommsen and Huelsen. On the contrary, it must be viewed in the light of the data furnished by existing inscriptions bearing on the subject. And this being so, it indubitably stands forth as a gloss, the recension of which and its insertion in the Lukan text must be assigned to a period when the work of political spies as well as of instruments of persecution was discharged as a matter of duty

¹ Kenyon, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the N.T.*, p. 361.

² R. Paribeni, 'Dei Milites Frumentarii e dell' Approvvigionamento della Corte Imperiale,' in *Bull. dell' Istituto Archaeologico*, Sez. Rom. xx. 310.

by the *Peregrini*, that is to say, between the times of Marcus Aurelius and those of Decius.

Not only this, but the unknown writer of the gloss would seem to have laboured under the influence of feelings different to some extent from those that animated the author of the Acts, who always made it a point not to drag the imperial authority into the first outbursts of anti-Christian persecution; whereas according to the gloss in question the prisoner Paul is directly handed over to the custody of the *Peregrini*, a body of imperial spies, as a man of mark, but one to be labelled dangerous and seditious.

Are there to be found in the text other variants tending to confirm the existence of similar anti-imperial sentiments in the anonymous glosser? I have already remarked that it is impossible to look for one single explanation of the modifications met with in the text and that several individuals must have been responsible for their existence. I have endeavoured to discover some of these and to study them along the lines of a possible psychological basis. Amongst the rest, I have been struck with the apparently significant variants in the discourse of Gamaliel in the Sanhedrim wherein (Ac 5³⁹) to the celebrated phrase, 'If the work of the Apostles be of God you cannot overwhelm or demolish it,' text δ adds: 'neither you nor kings nor tyrants': οὔτε ὑμεῖς, οὔτε βασιλεῖς, οὔτε τύραννοι. Have we not here the echo of an imperial persecution?

In Ac 5²⁹, too, it would appear as if text δ expresses the command of obedience to God, with marked energy that is not without significance: ἀποκρθεῖς δὲ Πέτρος εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν· τίνι πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ, θεῷ ἢ ἀνθρώποις; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· θεῷ.

Moreover, it is worthy of note that if the gloss in Ac 28¹⁶ thus accurately reflects the military organization of Rome about a century and a half after the imprisonment of St. Paul, and seems to furnish complementary if tardy data to the scanty information given by the primitive Lukan text, the thought naturally arises that the writer of that precise gloss must have been familiar with Rome. Now it will not be out of place to remember that the principal representative of text δ of the Acts, the famous codex D, affords, together with the Latin version, highly probable indications of a Western origin, South Italian, perhaps, or Gallic. True, codex D is not earlier than the fifth or sixth century, but it certainly had behind it an indigenous Western tradition.

Finally, the Latin or Roman origin of the gloss in Ac 28¹⁶ would help to explain the Greek word στρατοπεδάρχης, which in this connexion has always been a puzzle. That in codex D the Latin language has exercised a profound influence on the Greek was maintained by Rendel Harris, denied by Gregory, and reaffirmed by Soden. To this hypothesis our text, if examined in the light of the facts already set forth, offers a new confirmation hitherto neglected or unknown.

In fact the appellative στρατοπεδάρχης is completely absent from the pages of the New Testament and primitive Christian literature. There are only two instances of its use in Eusebius (*H.E.* viii. 4. 2; ix. 5. 2) in passages untranslated by Rufinus, where, referring to the persecution under Diocletian and precisely to the repressive measures taken against the Christian soldiers, the Bishop of Cæsarea uses the word to allude in a general way to the principal authority in the army. The Latin and Greek terms do not correspond absolutely. The Latin is more specific; the Greek indefinite. It would seem only logical to think that the writer simply passed on from the former to the latter, in the absence of a more definite term, unless indeed we are to suppose that στρατοπεδάρχης, literally *Princeps Castrorum*, indicated by antonomasia the *princeps* of those *Castra peregrinorum*, the inhabitants of which, as a consequence of their unlovely profession as spies, were an object of closer and less favourable interest than the other soldiers, to the gossiping, restless Rome of Marcus Aurelius, Septimius Severus, and Decius.

ERNESTO BUONAIUTI.

Rome.

Amos vi. 5.

THE first word of this verse (הפרטים) has been regarded as of uncertain meaning. Various renderings have been suggested. They can be divided into two classes. Some commentators (as Driver, Marti, Nowack, Wellhausen) favour the rendering 'Those who sing, who improvise idly,' assuming that הפרטים refers to those who sing to the sound of the harp. Other commentators render this word by 'Those who tear (strike) the strings across the opening of the harp' (Hoffmann, Vollers, Siegfried). See, for both views and the different etymological explanations underlying them, Driver, *Amos*, p. 194 and p. 236;

Harper, *Amos*, p. 148 and p. 150; Marti, *Dodeka-propheton*, p. 201; also the *Oxford* (Gesenius) *Hebrew Lexicon*, p. 827. Both renderings are already to be found in Kimḥi, *ad loc.*

The first rendering ('to sing,' 'to improvise idly') seems to me entirely inadmissible by reason of the context. The words *על פי הנבל* point to playing only, not to singing to the sound of the harp. The second rendering gives a better sense. But 'to tear the strings' is not satisfactory, as *הפרטים* is followed immediately by *על פי הנבל*. If the object had been the strings we would have expected a word for strings after *הפרטים*.

It seems to me that *פרט* means here 'to divide.' *פרט*, in the meaning 'to divide,' 'to separate,' occurs frequently in Talmudic Hebrew. Cf. Levy, *Neuhebr. u. chald. Wörterbuch*, Part IV., p. 110; see also the *Oxford Lexicon*, *l.c.* And I think that the 'dividing' refers here to *the fingers of the player*. When the musician played on the harp he did so by dividing his fingers and guiding them over the strings of the harp. 'To divide (the fingers)' therefore meant 'to play.' *פרט*, I venture to suggest, was then used in the same sense as *נגן*, and probably was a technical term for 'playing' on the harp. The word *הפרטים* has therefore to be rendered simply 'those who play.' The use of *על פי הנבל* instead of *על הנבל* is apparently due to the fact that the fingers touched the mouth, *i.e.* the strings of the harp, and not the whole harp.

The meaning of *הפרטים* thus becomes perfectly clear, etymologically and technically.

SAMUEL DAICHES.

Jews' College, London.

Aramaic Incantation Texts.¹

THE Aramaic Incantation Texts, published by Professor Montgomery, are a selection from the Museum Collection of the University of Pennsylvania. The bowls on which they are written were discovered in the upper strata at Nippur, and the texts are similar to others already published. Professor Montgomery has made use of this pre-existing material, improving in many ways upon the readings and interpretation given, while he has

succeeded in placing these texts more exactly in relation to magical literature as a whole. He has selected forty texts for decipherment, transliteration, translation, and commentary, all drawn from a single locality, yet such is the mode of treatment that the impression is given of a detailed and comprehensive survey of the whole field of incantation literature.

Three Aramaic dialects and scripts appear, namely, 'Rabbinic' (in use among Jews in Babylonia), Syriac, and Mandaic. In transcription these have been reduced to a common form in the ordinary Hebrew characters, but the facsimiles are also presented in the plates. The contents of these non-literary texts are not of much intrinsic value, but with Professor Montgomery's introduction and comments they assume no slight measure of importance for those interested in the history of religions and in Early Church History, while students of Scripture will welcome the light they cast on many passages of the O.T. and N.T. It is said that Scripture quotation and reference are lacking in these Nippur bowls (p. 63), but this does not apply to Professor Montgomery's edition of them, since at least one hundred references to the O.T. and N.T. occur in the introduction (pp. 1-116), and one hundred and twenty in the commentary to individual texts. Several glossaries have been prepared, but we miss an index to passages of Scripture, which is worthy of a place considering the number of quotations and the importance of many of the references. In this connexion it may be remarked that of the volumes hitherto published by the Pennsylvania Museum authorities this one under review appears to have the most direct bearing on the Bible.

The purpose of the bowls is primarily to serve as a 'domestic phylactery,' to be classed with the abundant forms of this species of magic, *e.g.* the Jewish Mezuzoth (p. 43). They are made out in the name of private individuals, and the charm is supposed to cover a married couple, their children, their house, and their property, cattle, etc. A few are more specific in their purpose. What is written on the bowl is the main thing, the emphasis being placed on the power of the 'word' or 'name.' The praxis is not what it used to be in the days of Babylonian sorcery, although Professor Montgomery finds a virtue in the inverted position of the bowl or bowls, this symbolizing and effecting the repression and suppression of the evil spirits

¹ University of Pennsylvania, The Museum; Publications of the Babylonian Section, vol. iii. *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur*, by James A. Montgomery. Pp. 315 Plates XLI. Philadelphia, 1913.

(p. 42). In certain cases they were bound and sealed in the four corners of the house, the bowls being quadrupled and provided with an identical inscription, for which usage we are invited to compare the cylinder and prism texts deposited at the four corners of great buildings in ancient Mesopotamia. One is tempted further to compare the 'lamp and bowl' deposits in the foundations of Palestinian houses, usually in the form of a lamp within a bowl with another bowl superimposed. Such deposits are presently reckoned to be a survival of the barbarous practice of foundation-sacrifice, but, making due allowance for the interval of nearly two millennia that lies between, we may perhaps see in them the prototype, at least so far as the praxis is concerned, of the bowls deposited at Nippur and elsewhere in Babylonia.

The bowls are dated by Professor Montgomery at c. 600 A.D. He regards them as almost the earliest records in that line that can be exactly dated.

The magic of the bowls appears to be only a degenerate survival of more vigorous forms previously current throughout the Ancient East. The evil spirits (*e.g.* Liliths), the evil agencies, and the natural evils, which form the three chief sections of the magical texts, are still present, but the demons are time-worn and banal, and the spirit of the whole is *fin de siècle*. Working back to the origins and relations of the Bowl Magic, Professor Montgomery has much of interest to tell us (p. 110 ff.). He finds Egypto-Hellenistic magic is one of the prime sources of these texts, and the impression made upon him by his study is that they resemble much more this form of magic (*i.e.* as found in papyri) than that of ancient Babylonia (*i.e.* as found in cuneiform tablets), although, it must be noted, the texts have been unearthed in Babylonia. Still Babylonian influence is undoubtedly felt, and also Jewish, only the Jews received more than they gave. At 600 A.D. the matter stands thus: Babylonian, Jewish, Mandaic, Gnostic, Hellenistic, and indirectly Egyptian, elements are there, in various combinations; while the product was useful to any body of magicians, even as it was in demand on the part of every class of client, pagans, Persians, Jews, Christians, every kind of sect (p. 115). The bowls are, therefore, not so much illustrative of a special Jewish magic—although often spoken of as Jewish—as of the eclectic religious conditions of later Mesopotamia. A

remarkable feature noted in the absence of traces of the Zoroastrian system.

Such a highly specialized study, it may be judged, requires both intimate and extended knowledge, which, as is manifest upon every page, Professor Montgomery fully possesses. While experts will appreciate, as it deserves, the scholarly labour involved in the decipherment of the texts, and all that follows this, students at large, and especially students of the Bible, will be grateful for the illuminating and informative materials provided by the introduction. Professor Montgomery's contribution to the study of the wide field of magic, divination, and sorcery will have to be taken into account by future investigators, and they would do well to be guided by the cautious attitude of the writer, who, it may be said, is quite alive to the data already provided and to the immense advance recently made, and to keep in view these words: 'The study of magic is still in its beginnings, and students are too prone to find a genetic relation when we have to bear in mind that we are dealing with parallel workings of the human spirit operating in a universal and amazingly uniform field, while at the same time, particularly for the age when Hellenistic culture was dominant, we must give allowance for the interfusion of factors geographically most distant' (p. 110).

WILLIAM CRUICKSHANK.

Kinneff.

Genesis xiv. 14 (עֲדָן).

IN this verse the Massoretic Text is to be suspected for 'internal' reasons. Professor Skinner writes: 'The name [Dan] originated in the period of the Judges (Jos 19⁴⁷, Jg 18²⁹); and it is singular that such a prolepsis should occur in a document elsewhere so careful of the appearance of antiquity' ('International Crit. Com.' on *Genesis*, p. 267).

Mr. H. M. Wiener, in *Pentateuchal Studies*, p. 28, mentions that in the larger Cambridge Septuagint 'Dan' and 'Dathan' are recorded as variants. Though these of themselves give no suitable sense, their existence leads to the conclusion that the ordinarily received text of the LXX has been 'corrected' to bring it into harmony with M.T.; and they suggest a simple and wholly satisfactory conjectural emendation.

If we compare the letters of these variants, as

they would have appeared in the old Hebrew script, it is easy to see that both may have arisen from an original הם ; a badly made ה or a ה partially illegible from long use of the MS. could easily be mistaken for ד or might even be incorrectly separated by a copyist into ד ת ; and the old מ and נ were sufficiently alike to lead to a mistake in transcription.

We may therefore suppose that the original reading of this clause was $\text{וַיִּרְדֵּף עֲדֵיהֶם}$ = 'and he pursued until them,' *i.e.* until he caught them up. Cf. 2 K 9¹⁸, $\text{בֹּא הַמַּלְאָךְ עֲדֵיהֶם}$ = 'the messenger has come up to them,' *i.e.* has reached them. V.¹⁵ is the natural sequence of the statement that he had caught them up.

It is to be noted as supporting this reading that וַיִּרְדֵּף is usually followed by a direct accusative, or by a prepositional phrase introducing the object of the pursuit. In 1 S 20¹⁰ is the only other passage in the M.T. where a finite tense of the verb is used absolutely.

Further, only in this passage (Gn 14¹⁴) does the M.T. use עַד after וַיִּרְדֵּף to introduce the place to which the pursuit was continued without the object having previously been mentioned.

In making these last two statements, I have followed the *Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance*. The two points are not essential to the acceptance of the suggested emendation; but if they are correct they strongly support it.

W. R. W. GARDNER.

Zeitoun, Egypt.

'Likeness.'

HAS it occurred to your readers how much is lacking of force and concreteness in our word 'likeness' as a translation of ὁμοίωμα as used by St. Paul? The characteristic English usage, 'a good likeness,' refers to a drawing or sculpture or photograph,

something in a material usually quite different from that of the subject. But ὁμοίωμα seems to mean a copy or facsimile or replica, indistinguishable in substance from the original. I venture, therefore, to propose a slight change of idiom as the best way of representing the meaning of the Greek, as follows:—

Ro 1²³ (allusion to Ps 106²⁰), 'exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for an image like the image of corruptible man, and birds, and quadrupeds, and reptiles.' An idol, though it claims to be something very different, is in the end no more than an image of man or beast. It may become grotesque or hideous in the attempt to depict superhuman traits, but succeeds only in being a copy of familiar forms.

Ro 5¹⁴, 'that had not sinned with a transgression like Adam's.'

Ro 6⁵, 'if we have become assimilated (to Christ) by a death like his, we shall be so also by a like resurrection to his.'

Ro 8³, 'sending his own Son in flesh like the flesh of sin.' In outward appearance our Lord entirely resembled other men, though essentially so different from them.

Ph 2⁷, 'but effaced himself in taking the form of a slave, becoming a man like (other) men.' (The literal translation of ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν in this verse, 'emptied himself,' always seems to me to raise unnecessary difficulties. The word is surely used in an advanced metaphorical sense just as in other places in the N.T., where it is rendered 'make void'.)

The example in the Book of Revelation (9⁷) is somewhat different from any of the above quoted, though the same method may be applied in translating it too: 'The things like locusts were like horses got ready for war.'

ALEX. R. MACKENZIE.

Yungling, Manchuria.

Entre Nous.

Illustrations from the War.

The Editor offers a set of the *Great Texts of the Bible* (twenty volumes), or their equivalent in other books chosen from Messrs. T. & T. Clark's catalogue, for the best series of illustrations of the Bible on religious and ethical topics from incidents

connected with the War. He offers also a set of the *Greater Men and Women of the Bible* (six volumes)—or their equivalent as before—for the second best series. The texts or topics illustrated should be given, and the source of the illustration, together with the date.

The illustrations should be sent before the end of August. They must refer to incidents occurring not earlier than February.

Prayer as a Pulpit Theme.

Some notes will be found elsewhere on the preaching of topics instead of texts. The Roman Catholic preacher seems to have just discovered the topic. In the end of last year a free translation was made, by Professor P. A. Beecher, of Father Schouppe's *Adjumenta Oratoris Sacri*, and was published under the title of *Pulpit Themes* (Gill; 7s. 6d. net). The demand was instantaneous and exhaustive. In six weeks the eleven hundred copies of the first edition were sold. What is the character of the book? In answer let us quote the complete treatment of one of the topics. Let us take Prayer.

PRAYER.

FIRST DISCOURSE.

General View.

We ought always to pray and not to faint.—Lk 18¹.

Prayer is so essential to religion that it is in a manner a compendium of all spirituality. The instinct for prayer is imprinted on the heart of man; so much so that even amongst pagan peoples there is not found a religion which does not insist on prayer.

The Christian religion especially is a religion of prayer. It commends nothing more earnestly than the exercise of prayer. Its Founder, Jesus Christ, was ever communing with His Father; whilst the Prophets, Apostles, and all the Saints were men of prayer.

Accordingly, he who has the spirit of prayer is truly religious, is truly a Christian, and will attain the promised rewards: so that it has come to be recognized that the spirit of prayer is a sign of predestination.

That we may more and more acquire this spirit, we shall consider:

I. THE EXCELLENCE OF PRAYER.

II. THE EFFICACY OF PRAYER.

III. THE NECESSITY OF PRAYER.

IV. THE PRACTICE OF IT.

I. THE EXCELLENCE OF PRAYER.

I. He who understands this will not ask why

he should pray; but rather will exclaim: whence is it given to me that I can pray?

2. And well may he so exclaim, for prayer is a communion with God Himself. . . .

3. Like incense it ascends and floats before the throne of God, and has incense as its symbol: *Another angel came, and stood before the altar, having a golden censor; and there was given to him much incense, that he should offer of the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar, which is before the throne of God* (Apoc. 8³).

4. It is a connection or communication with heaven, having as another image the ladder of Jacob: *Our conversation is in heaven* (Phil. 3²⁰).

5. It is the language of the children of God. . . .

6. It is a certain sign of salvation.—But on the other hand, to quote the words of S. Bonaventure: *When I see a man not loving the exercise of prayer, not imbued with a fervent and vehement desire for it, and not caring to avail of the divine privilege of communion with God, I conclude that he is moulded of coarse and common clay—a man who, spiritually, is already dead.*

II. THE EFFICACY OF PRAYER.

1. It enriches with all good things, and delivers from all evils. . . . It obtains for us the things that are eternal, and the temporal in so far as they are to our advantage. . . . It delivers from evils, past, present, and to come; as well as from what afflicts us externally and internally, whether in body or in soul.

2. It is the key of heaven . . . Aug. serm. 229.

3. It is a golden chain let down from heaven to earth, by which graces are drawn from above, and souls are drawn from below.

[A well-known poet has said:

For what are men better than sheep or goats
That nourish a blind life within the brain,
If knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
Both for themselves, and those who call them
friends!

For so the whole round earth is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.]

4. It is an arrow that speeds through the heavens, and falls at the feet of God.

5. It is *the arrow of the Lord's deliverance* (4 K 13¹⁷)—the armour of the strong—the city of refuge. . . .

6. It is more powerful than armies in battle

array. . . . It is more powerful than the devil. Yes even it can conquer God Himself and make Him drop from His hands the thunderbolts of His justice. Of this we have a striking example in Exodus: *And the Lord said to Moses: Let me alone that my wrath may be kindled against them. . . . But Moses besought the Lord his God. . . . And the Lord was appeased from doing the evil which he had spoken against his people* (Ex 32¹⁰ and following).

7. The earth is fertile; but its fertility cannot be compared with the fruits of prayer. And this can be confirmed by testimony and example. . . .

III. NECESSITY OF PRAYER.

In the first place the misery with which we are clothed proves it—of ourselves we are *wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked*.

2. Then there is the will of God, which has decreed that prayer is necessary, by necessity of *precept and means*. The necessity of precept is evident from many texts of Scripture, by which we are commanded to pray: *Ask and it shall be given you* (Mt 7⁷). *We ought always to pray, and not to faint* (Lk 18¹). The necessity of *means* is proved from the fact, on the one hand, that we need daily helps for our salvation, and, on the other, that God has decreed not to give them except to those who ask and pray. And God has so decreed because this is the only way of bringing home to us that our salvation and all good things come from Him; and because it is our only way of confessing our total dependence on Him, and of giving Him unceasing thanks. . . .

3. A father wishes that his children should ask him for good things; so too does God. . . .

4. As the earth, although most fertile, requires cultivation and irrigation, so the soul, no matter how otherwise well disposed, needs prayer. . . .

5. Prayer is the light of the soul,—its food,—and its respiration.

6. Prayer is the armour of God's soldier in the day of battle. . . .

7. Wherefore, he who prays shall want nothing, and shall rise superior to his enemies; but he who does not pray shall lack everything, and shall be the sport and mockery of his enemies.

IV. PRACTICE OF PRAYER.

1. Prayer is easy. The slightest elevation of the soul to God—that is prayer. . . . Every

beggar, every infant however weak, knows how to ask, and to make known what he desires; in like manner every one can pray, provided he realizes his want.

2. The characteristics or qualities of good prayer are: humility, confidence, and perseverance; and a necessary condition is recollection of the divine presence, *that one should by vivid faith prostrate oneself at the feet of the Lord, as a son at the feet of his father*.

3. What is necessary before, during, and after prayer? Before prayer, preparation; during prayer, piety; after prayer, harmony of life with the things sought for. . . .

4. Is prayer always heard? Yes, infallibly, if the conditions are fulfilled. . . . What are these conditions?

5. There are various classes of Christians in respect to prayer:—(1) There are those who do not pray; (2) those who pray badly; (3) those who pray well.

6. Why are so many not heard? . . . Frequently they ask for temporal things, without caring to detest their sins, and seek first the friendship of God. . . .

7. The different kinds of prayer are vocal, mental, ejaculatory. . . .

8. How are we to interpret the continuous prayer spoken of by Christ? (Lk 18¹).

9. It will be most helpful to explain in detail to the people the Lord's Prayer, and other forms of prayer.

10. How comes it that many cannot recite the Lord's Prayer without insincerity?

11. What are the impediments to prayer? How can they be removed? . . .

12. Our prayer should be addressed not only to God and Christ Jesus, but also to the Blessed Virgin Mary, to the Angels and Saints. . . .

Fellowship.

We have been much surprised to find ourselves caught by a book on the Pilgrim's Progress. Not that we thought we had exhausted the Pilgrim's Progress. But we did think we had got to the end of the good books on it. This is a small volume, one of Kelly's 'Manuals for Christian Thinkers.' Its title is *The Pilgrim Road* (1s. net), its author the Rev. W. B. Fitzgerald.

Besides its interest as an interpretation, the book is a perpetual stimulus to thought, especially if the

thinking mind is a preacher's. Here, for example, is something on Fellowship. The 'house' referred to is the Palace Beautiful, of course.

Within the house the great thought is *Fellowship*: fellowship here and now: fellowship with the past: and a joyous fellowship to look forward to in the future.

Christian, as soon as he enters, finds himself welcomed into a family. Friendship is the atmosphere of the place. He is no longer a lonely man, hunted by his sins and jeered at by his neighbours, but a member of a gracious household. All are interested in him, and cheer him by their conversation; and he is tactfully encouraged to tell the story of his own experiences.

This joyous fellowship reaches its climax in the communion of the Holy Supper. They sit down together to a common meal,

'and all their talk at the Table was about the Lord of the Hill: about what He had done, and wherefore He did what He did, and why He had builded that House: and by what they said I perceived that He had been a great Warrior, and had fought with and slain him that had the power of Death, but not without great danger to Himself, which made me love Him the more.'

The scene to Bunyan's mind is so vivid and moving that, in the last sentence, he unconsciously drops into the first person. He identifies himself with Christian.

But this was not all. On the following day Christian is taken into the Library and is shown the Records of the Past. From these he discovers that he is only one of 'a great multitude whom no man can number,' who once suffered as he has suffered, and found deliverance in the same Saviour. And their deeds of valour inspire him with high resolve. His devotion is enriched by the thought of his oneness with the Church of the past.

Then there is a fellowship yet to come. On the last morning he was taken to the top of the House, and away in the sunny south he saw 'a most pleasant Mountainous Country, beautified with woods, vineyards, fruits of all sorts; flowers also, with springs and fountains, very delectable to behold.' It was Immanuel's land, which after many strivings he would reach. Not the goal itself, but within sight of it. There, too, he will not be alone, for the Mountains are 'common to and for all Pilgrims.' It is a thought, sometimes

a little overlooked, of the possibilities of the communion of saints in the closing years of life. 'From thence,' he is told, 'thou mayest see to the Gate of the Celestial City.'

Bunyan was in harmony with the New Testament in making Fellowship the central idea of the Church. Whatever else the Church may mean, this is essential.

When John Wesley was acting as curate to his father at Epworth he was told of a Lincolnshire villager who, even in those dark days, had won respect from his neighbours by reason of his goodness; and, ready as ever to learn even from the humblest, Wesley visited him. One sentence the old man spoke was never forgotten:

'Sir, you wish to serve God and go to heaven. Remember, you cannot serve Him alone: you must therefore find companions or make them: the Bible knows nothing of solitary religion.' The words went deep, and when the time came for Wesley to make provision for the spiritual needs of the awakened multitudes of the eighteenth century he made Fellowship the very foundation of the Methodist Society.

The place of fellowship is very forcefully presented by Phillips Brooks in *The Influence of Jesus*:

'Jesus begins with the individual. He always does. His first and deepest touches are on the single soul. Before all social life there is the personal consciousness and its mysterious private relations to the Father from whom it came.'

'But,' he continues, '*there are some things of the individual life which the individual cannot get save in the company of fellow-men.*' There are some parts of his own true life always in his brethren's keeping, for which he must go to them. That the individual may find and be his own truest and fullest self, Jesus, his Master, leads him to his fellows.'

Those words go deep down to the philosophy of life, and in days when we are becoming more and more reticent in spiritual things they need to be carefully weighed. We join the Church, not merely for the sake of others, but also for our own sakes, because we, without them, cannot be perfected. The same thought is well expressed by Dr. Hunter in *The Coming Church*:

'The Christian disciple who has only heard the personal call of the Lord has heard but half of His message. 'Together in My name,' is also

a law of His order and way of life. His redeeming work begins with the single soul, but it does not end there. . . . The tie which relates us to Him also binds us to all His brethren, and gives us a sense of membership in a communion which is beyond all earthly banding and disbanding. In true fellowship with the Son of Man and the Son of God, we are in fellowship with the whole family of God on earth and in heaven.'

Dr. Hunter believes that on the foundation of such fellowship there may be built 'a Church large enough and broad enough to welcome and receive all disciples of Christ.' And he endeavours to describe it. 'A genuine Catholic Church—which in its terms of communion is as comprehensive as the Christian life—must have for its basis of union

'not uniformity of order and ritual,
'not views and opinions,
'not sameness of religious experience,
'but mutual spiritual sympathy, aspiration, and purpose—aspiration, not attainment; purpose, not character.'

And it will seek to meet and satisfy in and through its services of worship many and varied wants and sympathies and tastes; while its 'message' will be 'as large as the Gospel of Jesus Christ, glad tidings for all peoples.'

Such a Church may still be a dream, a vision of things to come. But it is very like the House Beautiful. And if ever it appears on earth we shall say, in phrases familiar in the Apostles' Creed, the Litany, and Te Deum, this is indeed the

Holy Catholic Church.
Thy Holy Church Universal.
The Holy Church throughout the world.

TWO POETS.

Stephen Southwold.

Mr. Southwold is not a great poet, and he knows it. But he is a poet. He is not overjoyed to write down the obvious in lines of irregular length; he has felt. What he says is his own, gained by some sacrifice. See him in the poem on

THE FACE OF GOD.

My fetters snapt, and my immanacled soul
Stood free. Then upward streaming from its
cell
Burst this terrene control.
I watched the level earth's grey bosom swell
Beneath me till it fell

Under my feet a spinning point of light:
The unnumbered planets streamed
Gold motes across the universal night,
And faintly gleamed
A waning radiance: the vast mantle interknit
With cosmic light grew dark; and round me prest,
In void made manifest,
The unfathomable blackness of the infinite.

Meseemed all time passed like a wing's swift beat,
And I was cold and desolate with dread,
And in my head
The eternal silence cried; and everywhere
Was God: such peace enwrap my every sense,
With His own immanence,
That all my soul became a breathing prayer
About His judgment-seat.

And a great light shone, and from the deep beneath
The beamy planets and star-dust updrew
Into its spreading glory, and became
An ordered part
Of that white sacred Flame
Whose inmost heart
Held all things: from the radiance a breath
Of quiet sound like a soft murmur grew
Into a swelling song, wherein the fire
Of every rapt and tremulous cadence sang,
Till the illumed and infinite spaces rang
With whispering echoes of divine Desire.

The title of the book is *The Common Day* (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net).

Ella Wheeler Wilcox.

In Mrs. Wilcox's *Poems of Optimism* (Gay & Hancock; 1s. net) there is much variety—variety of metre and of merit. It is not the most pleasing of the volumes which we have seen, though there are pleasing poems in it. The subject of Divorce is dealt with three or four times and the seamy side exhibited. The title is not always applicable, but it is applicable to this short poem on

REWARD.

Fate used me meanly; but I looked at her and
laughed,
That none might know how bitter was the cup
I quaffed.
Along came Joy, and paused beside me where
I sat,
Saying, 'I came to see what you were laughing at.'

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.